arXiv:1612.08763v1 [q-bio.MN] 27 Dec 2016

THE STRUCTURE OF MESSI BIOLOGICAL SYSTEMS

MERCEDES PÉREZ MILLÁN* AND ALICIA DICKENSTEIN*,**

Abstract. We introduce a general framework for biological systems, called MESSI systems, that describe Modifications of type Enzyme-Substrate or Swap with Intermediates, and we prove general results based on the network structure. Many post-translational modification networks are MESSI systems. For example: the motifs in [13], sequential distributive multisite phosphorylation networks [35], sequential processive multisite phosphorylation networks [5], most of the examples in [1], phosphorylation cascades [3], two component systems as in [26], the bacterial EnvZ/OmpR network in [43] and all linear networks. We show that, under mass-action kinetics, MESSI systems are conservative. We simplify the study of steady states of these systems by explicit elimination of intermediate complexes (inspired by [12, 15, 46]) and we define an important subclass of MESSI systems with toric steady states [35]. We give for MESSI systems with toric steady states an easy algorithm to determine the capacity for multistationarity. In this case, the algorithm provides rate constants for which multistationarity takes place, based on the theory of oriented matroids.

Keywords: biological networks, steady states, MESSI systems, multistationarity

Introduction

Many processes within cells involve some kind of post-translational modification of proteins. We introduce a general framework for biological systems that describe Modifications of type Enzyme-Substrate or Swap with Intermediates, which we call MESSI systems, and which allows us to prove general results on their dynamics from the structure of the network, under mass-action kinetics. This subclass of mechanisms has attracted considerable theoretical attention due to its abundance in nature and the special characteristics in the topologies of the networks.

The basic idea in the definition of MESSI systems (see Definition 2) is that the mathematical modeling reflects the different chemical behaviors. The chemical species can be grouped into different subsets according to the way they participate in the reactions, very much akin to the intuitive partition of the species according to their function. We show that MESSI systems are conservative (and thus all trajectories are defined for any positive time), and we study the important questions of persistence and multistationarity. Informally, persistence means that no species which is present can tend to be eliminated in the course of the reaction [1]. Multistationarity (see Definition 1) is also a crucial property, since its occurrence can be thought of as a mechanism for switching between different response states in cell signaling systems and enables multiple outcomes for cellular-decision making, with the same total amounts.

Examples of MESSI systems of major biological importance are phosporylation cascades, such as the mitogen-activated protein kinases (MAPKs) cascades [23, 25]. MAPKs are serine/threonine kinases that play an essential role in signal transduction by modulating gene transcription in the nucleus in response to changes in the cellular environment, and participate in a number of disease states including chronic inflammation and cancer [6, 27, 34, 40, 53] as they control key cellular functions [21, 34, 41, 48, 52]. Also the *multisite phosphorylation system* is a MESSI system. This network describes the phosphorylation of a protein in multiple sites by a kinase/phosphatase pair in a sequential and distributive mechanism [7, 19, 20, 23, 28, 42]. In prokaryotic cells, an example

This work was partially supported by UBACYT 20020100100242, CONICET PIP 20110100580, and ANPCyT PICT 2013-1110, Argentina.



FIGURE 1. Examples of MESSI systems: Sequential n-site phosphorylation/dephosphorlation (A) distributive case [35, 51], (B) processive case [5, 30]; (C) Phosphorylation cascade; (D) Schematic diagram of an EnvZ-OmpR bacterial model [43].

of MESSI system can be found in [43], representing the *Escherichia coli* EnvZ-OmpR system which consists of the sensor kinase EnvZ, and the response-regulator OmpR (see also [22, 24, 36, 44, 54]). This signaling system is a prototypical two-component signaling system [36, 44]. All linear systems are also MESSI.

We depict in Figures 1 and 2 some examples of important biochemical networks which are MESSI networks [1]. Figure 1(A) features the n-site phosphorylation-dephosphorylation of a protein by a kinase-phosphatase pair in a sequential and distributive mechanism. The total of n phosphate groups are allowed to be added to the unphosphorylated substrate S_0 by an enzyme E. The substrate S_i is the phosphoform obtained from S_0 by attaching i phosphate groups to it. Each phosphoform can accept (via an enzymatic reaction involving E) or lose (via a reaction involving the phosphatase F) at most one phosphate; this means that the mechanism is "distributive". In addition, the phosphorylation is said to be "sequential" because multiple phosphate groups must be added in a specific order, and removed in a specific order as well. The sequential and processive phosphorylation/dephosphorylation of a substrate at n sites [30, 5] is depicted in Figure 1(B). The substrate undergoes $n > 1$ phosphorylations after binding to the kinase and forming the enzyme-substrate complex; only the fully phosphorylated substrate is released and hence only two phosphoforms have to be considered: the unphosphorylated substrate S_0 and fully phosphorylated substrate S_n. Processive dephosphorylation proceeds similarly. All the motifs in [13] are MESSI networks. Also, the phosphorylation cascades shown in Figure 2. The cascade in Figure 1(C) features the sequential activation of a specific MAPK kinase kinase (MAPKKK, denoted S) and a MAPK kinase (MAPKK, denoted P), which in turn phosphorylates and activates their downstream MAPK (denoted R). The activated forms are S_1, P_2 and R_2, respectively. Figure 2 features two cascade motifs with two layers, which are a combination of two one-site modification cycles with either a specific or the same phosphatase acting in each layer. It is already known [13] that the cascade in (A) exhibits multistationarity while the cascade in (B) is monostationary. We will recover these results under the framework of

[1] As usual, in the figures we summarize with the scheme $S_0 \overset{E}{\curvearrowright} S_1$ a sequence of reactions with intermediates such as $S_0 + E \underset{\kappa_2}{\overset{\kappa_1}{\rightleftarrows}} ES_0 \overset{\kappa_3}{\to} S_1 + E$.



FIGURE 2. Same and different phosphatases in two different MESSI cascades

MESSI systems (they will both prove to be s-toric MESSI systems, see Definition 19). We will morover consider the cascade in Figure 2 (A) as one of our running examples in this article, and sometimes we will also include a sequestration drug $P_1 + D \rightleftarrows P_1D$ in the network. Figure 1(D) depicts a schematic diagram of an EnvZ-OmpR bacterial model [43], which is a MESSI network. The sensor EnvZ (X) phosphorylates itself by binding and breaking down ATP (T). The phosphorylated form X_p catalyzes the transfer of a phosphoryl group to the response-regulator OmpR (Y). X, together with ATP dephosphorylates Y_p, a transcription factor that regulates the expression of various protein pores.

Our work continues the ideas in Chemical Reaction Network Theory (CNRT), which connects qualitative properties of ordinary differential equations corresponding to a reaction network to the network structure. CNRT has been developed over the last fourty years, initially through the work of Horn and Jackson and subsequently by Feinberg and his students and collaborators (for example see [9, 10]) and Vol'pert [50]. Biochemical reaction networks, that is chemical reaction networks in biochemistry, is the principal current application of these developments. In particular, our work is inspired in previous articles by Thomson and Gunawardena [46], Mirzaev and Gunawardena [31], Feliu and Wiuf [12, 15], and Müller et al. [33]. Also related to our work are the papers by Gnacadja on constructive chemical reaction networks [16, 17]. The MESSI structure we propose clarifies and unifies most of these approaches. The precise conditions are given in Definitions 2 and 3. In particular, complexes in a MESSI network are mono or bimolecular. As remarked in [46], one main assumption for this modeling is that donor molecules that provide modifiers are kept at constant concentration on the time scaling of the reactions we are modeling, and their effects can be absorbed into the rate constants. The main difference between our and their approach is that they do not allow a species to act as a substrate in one reaction and then as an enzyme in another, which in particular excludes the enzymatic cascades. Moreover, they do not allow swaps.

Theorem 8 explicitly describes conservation relations that imply that any MESSI system is conservative. Theorem 13 gives conditions that ensure that a MESSI system is persistent. Theorem 17 expresses the role of intermediates in the steady states of the system. Theorem 20 shows a frequent class of MESSI systems with special steady states, cut out by binomial equations and termed as toric steady states [35], that allow for an easier determination of multistationarity. We give for MESSI systems with toric steady states an algorithm to determine the capacity for multistationarity based on Theorem 26. If this is the case, the algorithm provides rate constants for which multistationarity takes place, based on the theory of oriented matroids [2]. This is a specialized procedure, easy to tune to produce different choices of rate constants, besides the general algorithms for injectivity implemented for instance by Feinberg and his group in the Chemical Reaction Network Toolbox [47] (see other algorithms for chemical reaction networks at `https://reaction-networks.net/wiki/Mathematics_of_Reaction_Networks`).

MESSI systems

In this section we review the notion of a chemical reaction network in order to introduce the definition of MESSI networks and MESSI systems (when these networks are endowed with mass-action kinetics). The conditions in the definition might seem to be very restrictive (mathematically), but indeed we show many examples of *popular* networks in systems biology that lie in this framework.

Chemical reaction systems

We briefly recall the basic setup of chemical reaction networks and how they give rise to an autonomous dynamical system under mass-action kinetics (see Example 28 in the Supplementary Information (SI)) in the Appendix. Given a set of s chemical species, a *chemical reaction network* on this set of species is a finite directed graph whose vertices are indicated by complexes and whose edges are labeled by parameters (reaction rate constants). The labeled digraph is denoted $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \boldsymbol{\kappa})$, with vertex set $\mathcal{V}$, edge set $\mathcal{E}$ and edge labels $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \in \mathbb{R}^{\#\mathcal{E}}_{>0}$. If $(y, y') \in \mathcal{E}$, we note $y \to y'$. Complexes determine vectors in $\mathbb{Z}^s_{\geq 0}$ according to the stoichiometry of the species they consist of. We identify a complex with its corresponding vector and also with the formal linear combination of species specified by its coordinates.

The unknowns $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_s$ represent the concentrations of the species in the network, and we regard them as functions of time t. Under mass-action kinetics, the chemical reaction network G defines the following chemical reaction dynamical system:

$$\dot{x} \;=\; \left(\frac{dx_1}{dt}, \frac{dx_2}{dt}, \ldots, \frac{dx_s}{dt}\right) \;=\; \sum_{y \to y'} \kappa_{yy'}\, x^y\, (y' - y). \tag{1}$$

where $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_s)$ and $x^y = x_1^{y_1} \cdots x_s^{y_s}$. The right-hand side of each differential equation dx_ℓ/dt is a polynomial f_ℓ in $x_1, \ldots, x_s$ with real coefficients. The associated *steady state variety* is defined as the common non-negative solutions of the polynomials f_ℓ, that is, as all points in $\mathbb{R}^s_{\geq 0}$ where all derivatives vanish. Steady states correspond to constant trajectories, that explain the long time behaviour of the dynamics.

The linear subspace spanned by the reaction vectors $S = \{y' - y \,:\, y \to y'\}$ is called the *stoichiometric subspace*. Notice from (1) that the vector $\dot{x}(t)$ lies in S for all time t. In fact, a trajectory $x(t)$ beginning at a vector $x(0) = x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^s_{\geq 0}$ remains in the *stoichiometric compatibility class* $(x^0 + S) \cap \mathbb{R}^s_{\geq 0}$ for all positive time. The equations of $x^0 + S$ give rise to the *conservation relations* of the system.

Definition 1. We say that the system *has the capacity for multistationarity* if there exists a choice of rate constants $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ such that there are two or more steady states in one stoichiometric compatibility class for some initial state $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^s_{\geq 0}$. On the other hand, if for any choice of rate constants, there is at most one steady state in each stoichiometric compatibility class, the system is said to be *monostationary*.

It may happen that the vectors $\dot{x}(t)$ lay in a smaller subspace $S' \subseteq S$, called the *kinetic subspace* [11]. In this case, the trajectories live in $(x^0 + S') \cap \mathbb{R}^s_{\geq 0}$ for some initial state $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^s_{\geq 0}$, and the concepts of mono and multistationarity might be defined with respect to this smaller affine subspace. In this article, we focus on the classical Definition 1.

Definition of MESSI systems

A MESSI network is a particular type of chemical reaction network, which includes all monomolecular (linear) ones. We denote by $\mathscr{S}$ the set of **species**. As we mentioned in the introduction, the

main ingredient in the definition is the existence of a **partition** of $\mathscr{S}$, that is, a decomposition into disjoint subsets:

$$\mathscr{S} = \mathscr{S}^{(0)} \bigsqcup \mathscr{S}^{(1)} \bigsqcup \mathscr{S}^{(2)} \bigsqcup \cdots \bigsqcup \mathscr{S}^{(m)}, \tag{2}$$

where $m \geq 1$ and $\bigsqcup$ denotes disjoint union. We call the cardinalities $\#\mathscr{S}^{(0)} = p$, $\#\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)} = n_\alpha$ for any $\alpha > 0$ and $\sum_{\alpha>0} n_\alpha = n$. We allow p to be 0, but we assume that all n_α are positive. Species in $\mathscr{S}^{(0)}$ are called *intermediate* and species in $\mathscr{S}_1 := \mathscr{S} \setminus \mathscr{S}^{(0)}$ are termed *non-intermediate* or *core*. When convenient, we will distinguish intermediate and core species in the notation in the following way: $\mathscr{S}^{(0)} = \{U_1, \ldots, U_p\}$, $\mathscr{S}_1 = \{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$. Thus, in a MESSI network, the vectors determined by the **complexes** $(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_p, \nu_1, \ldots, \nu_n)$ live in $\mathbb{Z}^{p+n}_{\geq 0}$, and define the formal linear combination of species $\sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i U_i + \sum_{j=1}^n \nu_j X_j$. Complexes in a MESSI network are also partitioned into two disjoint sets, and we require the following conditions:

- ($\mathcal{N}_1$) *Intermediate complexes* are complexes that consist of a unique intermediate species that only appears in that complex. The vector corresponding to the unimolecular complex U_i is denoted by y_i.
- ($\mathcal{N}_2$) *Non-intermediate complexes* (or *core complexes* [15]) are mono or bimolecular and consist of either one or two non-intermediate species. If the non-intermediate complex consists of only the species X_i, the corresponding vector will be denoted by y_{i0}.
- ($\mathcal{N}_3$) When a non-intermediate complex consists of two species X_i, X_j, they *must* belong to *different* sets $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}, \mathscr{S}^{(\beta)}$ with $\alpha \neq \beta, \alpha, \beta \geq 1$. We also denote the complex $X_i + X_j = X_j + X_i$ by $y_{ij} = y_{ji}$.

We say that complex y reacts to complex y' **via intermediates** if either $y \to y'$ or there exists a path of reactions from y to y' *only through intermediate complexes*. This is denoted by $y \to_\circ y'$. The intermediate complexes of a MESSI system satisfy the following condition:

- ($\mathcal{C}$) For every intermediate complex y_k, there exist non-intermediate complexes y_{ij} and $y_{\ell m}$ such that $y_{ij} \to_\circ y_k$ and $y_k \to_\circ y_{\ell m}$.

Reactions in a MESSI network are constrained by the following rules:

- ($\mathcal{R}_1$) If three species are related by $X_i + X_j \to_\circ X_k$ or $X_k \to_\circ X_i + X_j$, then X_k is an intermediate species.
- ($\mathcal{R}_2$) If two non-intermediate species X_i, X_j are related by $X_i \to_\circ X_j$, then there exists $\alpha \geq 1$ such that both belong to $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$.
- ($\mathcal{R}_3$) If $X_i + X_j \to_\circ X_k + X_\ell$ then, there exist $\alpha \neq \beta$ such that $X_i, X_k \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$, $X_j, X_\ell \in \mathscr{S}^{(\beta)}$ or $X_i, X_\ell \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$, $X_j, X_k \in \mathscr{S}^{(\beta)}$.

For a better understanding of these rules, see Example 29 in the SI.

Definition 2. A chemical reaction network is a *MESSI network* if there is a partition of the set $\mathscr{S}$ of species as in (2), such that the partition of the complexes into intermediates and non-intermediates satisfies conditions $(\mathcal{N}_1), (\mathcal{N}_2), (\mathcal{N}_3)$ and $(\mathcal{C})$, and the reactions satisfy the rules $(\mathcal{R}_1), (\mathcal{R}_2)$ and $(\mathcal{R}_3)$. In this case we say that the given partition *defines a MESSI structure* on the network.

The main focus of this work are the properties of MESSI networks endowed with a kinetics. Throughout this text we will always assume mass-action kinetics.

Definition 3. We call a *MESSI system* the mass-action kinetics dynamical system as in (1) associated with a MESSI network.

We now define enzyme behaviour and swaps.

Definition 4. A species X_j that satisfies $X_i + X_j \to_\circ X_\ell + X_j$ for some X_i, X_ℓ, is said to act as an *enzyme*. A reaction via intermediates is called a *swap* if $X_i + X_j \to_\circ X_\ell + X_m$, and $i, j \notin \{\ell, m\}$ (so, neither X_i nor X_j acts as an enzyme in $X_i + X_j \to_\circ X_\ell + X_m$).

Example 5 (First running example)**.** Consider the network in Figure 2 (A), with digraph G:

$$S_0 + E \underset{\kappa_2}{\overset{\kappa_1}{\rightleftarrows}} ES_0 \overset{\kappa_3}{\to} S_1 + E \qquad S_1 + F \underset{\kappa_5}{\overset{\kappa_4}{\rightleftarrows}} FS_1 \overset{\kappa_6}{\to} S_0 + F$$

$$P_0 + S_1 \underset{\kappa_8}{\overset{\kappa_7}{\rightleftarrows}} S_1P_0 \overset{\kappa_9}{\to} P_1 + S_1 \qquad P_1 + F \underset{\kappa_{11}}{\overset{\kappa_{10}}{\rightleftarrows}} FP_1 \overset{\kappa_{12}}{\to} P_0 + F.$$

We can consider the following partition $\mathscr{S}^{(0)} = \{ES_0, FS_1, S_1P_0, FP_1\}$ (intermediate species), and $\mathscr{S}^{(1)} = \{S_0, S_1\}$, $\mathscr{S}^{(2)} = \{P_0, P_1\}$, $\mathscr{S}^{(3)} = \{E\}$, $\mathscr{S}^{(4)} = \{F\}$ (partition of the core species). The intermediate complexes correspond to the intermediate species, and the complement are non-intermediate complexes. This partition defines a MESSI structure in the network. In fact, there is another possible choice of partition which also gives a MESSI structure to the network, considering $\mathscr{S}^{(0)}, \mathscr{S}^{(1)}$ and $\mathscr{S}^{(2)}$ as before, but $\mathscr{S}^{(3)}$ and $\mathscr{S}^{(4)}$ are replaced by their union $\{E, F\}$. We can see in this example that species E and F only act as enzymes, while species S_1 acts as an enzyme in the second layer but in the first one it plays the role of a substrate of F and of a product of E.

Example 6 (Second running example)**.** An example of swap can be the seen in the transfer of a modifier molecule, such as a phosphate group in a two-component system, from one molecule to another. We consider as our second running example the EnvZ/OmpR system. The corresponding digraph G is featured in Figure 1(D). The only possible partition for this network to be a MESSI system is $\mathscr{S}^{(0)} = \{\mathrm{X}_p\mathrm{Y}, \mathrm{XTY}_p\}$, $\mathscr{S}^{(1)} = \{X, XT, X_p\}$, $\mathscr{S}^{(2)} = \{Y, Y_p\}$. The reaction via intermediates in the second connected component of the graph of reactions is a swap. On the other hand, XT acts as an enzyme in the last component of G.

Notice that a MESSI network is defined once the partition of $\mathscr{S}$ is given and all conditions and rules in Definition 2 are verified. As we saw in Example 5, there can be many ways to define a partition in the set of species of a network which define a MESSI structure. In that example, the first partition was a refinement of the second one. In general, if a species X_j in a MESSI network *only* acts as an enzyme we can consider a set $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)} = \{X_j\}$ (a singleton). However, there might be non-comparable partitions as we show in the SI. We define a partial order in the set of possible partitions of the species of a given biochemical network.

Definition 7. Given two partitions $\mathscr{S} = \mathscr{S}^{(0)} \sqcup \mathscr{S}^{(1)} \sqcup \mathscr{S}^{(2)} \sqcup \cdots \bigsqcup \mathscr{S}^{(m)}$ and $\mathscr{S} = \mathscr{S}'^{(0)} \sqcup \mathscr{S}'^{(1)} \sqcup \mathscr{S}'^{(2)} \sqcup \cdots \bigsqcup \mathscr{S}'^{(m')}$, we say that the first partition refines the second one if and only if $\mathscr{S}^{(0)} \supseteq \mathscr{S}'^{(0)}$ and for any $\alpha \geq 1$, there exists $\alpha' \geq 1$ such that $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)} \subseteq \mathscr{S}'^{(\alpha')}$. With this partial order we have the notion of a minimal partition.

Conservation relations and persistence in MESSI systems

We first describe the equations of the stoichiometric subspace of a MESSI system, which give linear conservation relations along the trajectories. We then focus on the steady states of MESSI systems. We make explicit the projection relation between the steady state variety of the original network with graph G and an associated network with graph G_1 without intermediate complexes. This is done via a process of elimination of the concentration of intermediate species inspired by Theorem 3.2 in [15]. When the MESSI system satisfies the extra condition $(\mathcal{C}')$ below, we show in Proposition 17 that the inverse of this projection is a monomial map in the concentrations of the species. We then give sufficient conditions for MESSI systems to be persistent.

Conservation relations

A chemical reaction system is said to be *conservative* if there exists a linear combination of the species in the network with all *positive* coefficients, which is constant along each trajectory (i.e., for all time t). Clearly, for any trajectory starting at a positive point, this constant is a positive real number. In this case, all stoichiometric compatibility classes are compact. In this section we show that MESSI systems are conservative, by exhibiting natural conservation relations. This implies that all trajectories are bounded and defined for any positive time.

We denote the concentration of the species with small letters. For example, u_i denotes the concentration of U_i and x_j denotes the concentration of X_j. Given a MESSI network and a partition of the species set as in Definition 2, we define for any $\alpha \geq 1$, the set of indices

$$\mathrm{Int}(\alpha) = \{k : \text{ there exists a reaction } y_{ij} \to_\circ y_k \text{ with either } X_i \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)} \text{ or } X_j \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}\}.$$

Note that the subsets $\mathrm{Int}(\alpha)$ are in general not disjoint, but condition $(\mathcal{C})$ implies that $\cup_{\alpha\geq 1}\mathrm{Int}\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)} = \mathscr{S}^{(0)}$. It is straightforward to see that the conditions imposed on a MESSI network ensure that for any $\alpha \geq 1$ the set of variables $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)} \cup \mathrm{Int}(\alpha)$ is a siphon [1], and the resulting steady state equations corresponding to the variables in $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)} \cup \mathrm{Int}(\alpha)$ are homogeneous of degree one in these variables, for any subset of core species in the partition of the species set $\mathscr{S}$. We will show in Theorem 8 below, that the following explicit linear conservation relations with $\{0, 1\}$ coefficients hold

$$\ell_\alpha(u, x) = C_\alpha, \text{ where } \ell_\alpha(u, x) = \sum_{X_i \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}} x_i + \sum_{k \in \mathrm{Int}(\alpha)} u_k, \tag{3}$$

for some constant C_α, which is positive if the trajectory intersects the positive orthant. This is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.1 in [15] and of Theorem 5.3 in [17]. The second part of Theorem 8 gives sufficient conditions for these relations to generate *all* the equations defining a stoichiometric compatibility class. We show in Example 30 in the SI that if we relax any of these conditions, the result is not true. See also Remark 31 in the SI on the conditions to ensure that the kinetic and the stoichiometric subspaces coincide.

Theorem 8. *Given a chemical reaction network G and a partition of the set of species $\mathscr{S}$ as in* (2) *that defines a MESSI structure, for each subset of species $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$, $1 \leq \alpha \leq m$, the linear form ℓ_α in* (3) *defines a conservation relation of the system. In particular, all MESSI systems are conservative.*

Furthermore, if there are no swaps in G, and the partition is minimal *in the poset of partitions defining a MESSI system structure on G, then* $\dim(S^\perp) = m$.

If moreover the stoichiometric subspace coincides with the kinetic subspace, then the only possible conservation relations in the system are linearly generated by the conservations (3) *for $1 \leq \alpha \leq m$.*

Example 9 (Examples 5 and 6, continued)**.** For the cascade with one phosphatase in Example 5, the hypotheses in Theorem 8 are satisfied and the conservation relations are the following (we use small letters for the concentration of the corresponding species):

$$s_0 + s_1 + u_1 + u_2 + u_3 = S_{tot}, \quad p_0 + p_1 + u_3 + u_4 = P_{tot},$$
$$e + u_1 = E_{tot}, \quad f + u_2 + u_4 = F_{tot},$$

where the concentration of the intermediates species es_0, fs_1, s_1p_0, fp_1 are denoted by u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, respectively. In Example 6, the conservation relations are:

$$x + x_T + x_p + x_py + x_Ty_p = X_{tot}, \quad y + y_p + x_py + x_Ty_p = Y_{tot}.$$

The associated digraphs

Given a directed graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \boldsymbol{\kappa})$ with a partition of the set of species as in (2) which defines a MESSI structure in the network, we associate to G three other digraphs, denoted by G_1, G_2, G_E.


G_1:
$S_0 + E \xrightarrow{\tau_1} S_1 + E$
$S_1 + F \xrightarrow{\tau_2} S_0 + F$
$P_0 + S_1 \xrightarrow{\tau_3} P_1 + S_1$
$P_1 + F \xrightarrow{\tau_4} P_0 + F$
G_2°:
$S_0 \underset{\tau_2 f}{\overset{\tau_1 e}{\rightleftarrows}} S_1$
$P_0 \underset{\tau_4 f}{\overset{\tau_3 s_1}{\rightleftarrows}} P_1$
G_E:
$\mathscr{S}^{(3)} \longrightarrow \mathscr{S}^{(1)} \longrightarrow \mathscr{S}^{(2)}$
$\mathscr{S}^{(4)}$
G_1:
$X \underset{\tau_2}{\overset{\tau_1}{\rightleftarrows}} XT \xrightarrow{\tau_3} X_p$
$X_p + Y \xrightarrow{\tau_4} X + Y_p$
$XT + Y_p \xrightarrow{\tau_5} XT + Y$
G_2°:
$X \underset{\tau_2}{\overset{\tau_1}{\rightleftarrows}} XT \xrightarrow{\tau_3} X_p$
$\tau_4 y$
$Y \underset{\tau_5 x_T}{\overset{\tau_4 x_p}{\rightleftarrows}} Y_p$
G_E:
$\mathscr{S}^{(1)} \rightleftarrows \mathscr{S}^{(2)}$

FIGURE 3. The graphs G_1, G_2° and G_E for the running examples. The corresponding sets $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$'s can be found in Example 14

First, we define the associated digraph $(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{E}_1)$ with set of n **species**, where the intermediate species have been eliminated and with the inherited partition on the set of core species:

$$\mathscr{S}_1 = \mathscr{S}^{(1)} \bigsqcup \mathscr{S}^{(2)} \bigsqcup \cdots \bigsqcup \mathscr{S}^{(m)} = \mathscr{S} \setminus \mathscr{S}^{(0)}. \tag{4}$$

The vertex set $\mathcal{V}_1$ consists of all the non-intermediate complexes y_{ij} and the edge set $\mathcal{E}_1 = \{y_{ij} \to y_{\ell m} : y_{ij}, y_{\ell m} \in \mathcal{V}_1 \text{ and } y_{ij} \to_\circ y_{\ell m} \text{ in } G\}$. Note that G_1 might have loops. It is easy to check that partition (4) defines a MESSI structure on G_1 for any choice of positive labels in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\#\mathcal{E}_1}$. In order to associate these labels, we recall that in [15, Theorem 3.1] the authors prove that there exists a rational map between the reaction constants, $\boldsymbol{\tau} : \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\#\mathcal{E}} \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\#\mathcal{E}_1}$, which verifies the following. We label the edges in G_1 with the real constants $\boldsymbol{\tau}(\boldsymbol{\kappa}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\#\mathcal{E}_1}$. The explicit expression for the rate constants $\boldsymbol{\tau}(\boldsymbol{\kappa})$ is given on display (15) in the proof of Theorem 3.1 in the Electronic Supplementary Material of [15]. The authors also prove in [15] that under this assignment, the steady states of the mass-action chemical reaction systems defined by and G and G_1 are in one-to-one correspondence. See also the more recent article [29].

We now introduce a new labeled associated digraph G_2. We first define a labeled multidigraph where we "hide" the concentrations of some of the species in the labels. The species set of G_2 is still $\mathscr{S}_1$. We keep all monomolecular reactions $X_i \to X_j$ in G_1 and for each reaction $X_i + X_\ell \xrightarrow{\tau} X_j + X_m$ in G_1, with $X_i, X_j \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$, $X_\ell, X_m \in \mathscr{S}^{(\beta)}$, we consider two reactions $X_i \xrightarrow{\tau x_\ell} X_j$ and $X_\ell \xrightarrow{\tau x_i} X_m$. We obtain in principle a multidigraph MG_2 that might contain loops or parallel edges between any pair of nodes (i.e., directed edges with the same source and target nodes). We associate the digraph G_2 with this multidigraph by collapsing into one edge all parallel edges. The label of an edge in G_2 is the *sum* of the labels of the parallel edges in the multidigraph. By rules $(\mathcal{R}_1), (\mathcal{R}_2)$ and $(\mathcal{R}_3)$, G_2 is a *linear* graph (its vertices are labeled by a single species) and the labels on the edges depend on the rate constants but might also depend on the concentrations $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. We will denote by G_2° the digraph obtained from the deletion of loops and isolated nodes of G_2.

Example 10 (Examples 5 and 6, continued)**.** The graphs G_1 and G_2° associated to the networks in Examples 5 and 6 are depicted in Figure 3.

Remark 11. It is important to notice that for any MESSI network with digraph G, the associated digraphs G_1 and G_2 *determine the same polynomial equations that define the steady states of* G. Indeed, if we consider G_2 in a mass-action fashion, we can see that the same terms are added and substracted, obtaining the same equations associated to G_1. However, we cannot recover the dynamical properties of G_1 (or G) from G_2 since we admit species (concentrations) as both vertices and edge labels.

Note that for each $\alpha \geq 1$, if one species of $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ appears on a vertex of G_2, by $(\mathcal{R}_2)$ and $(\mathcal{R}_3)$ and the construction of G_2, all the species in the vertices of the corresponding connected component of G_2 belong to the *same* subset $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ in the original partition (2). In fact, the same partition (4) defines a MESSI structure on G_2. Moreover,

Lemma 12. *The partition of the set of species $\mathscr{S}$ of G in* (2) *is minimal in the poset of partitions defining a MESSI structure on the network if and only if the set of intermediate species is maximal, the connected components of G_2 are in bijection with the subsets $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ and the set of nodes of the corresponding component equals $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$. Thus, by considering the connected components in G_2 we can refine any partition of the species set $\mathscr{S}$ to a minimal one defining a MESSI structure on G.*

Finally, given a MESSI system with a *minimal* partition of the set of species as in (2), we define a new graph G_E, whose vertices are the sets $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ for $\alpha \geq 1$, and there is an edge from $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ to $\mathscr{S}^{(\beta)}$ if there is a species in $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ in a *label* of an edge in G_2 between species of $\mathscr{S}^{(\beta)}$. Example 14 below shows the corresponding digraphs G_E for our two running examples.

Persistence

As MESSI systems are conservative by Theorem 8, we know by Theorem 2 in [1] that a MESSI system is persistent when there are no *relevant boundary steady states*. This means that there are no steady states in the intersection of the boundary $\partial(\mathbb{R}^s_{\geq 0})$ of the non-negative orthant with a stoichiometric compatibility class through a point in $\mathbb{R}^s_{>0}$. Persistence means that any trajectory starting from a point with positive coordinates stays at a positive distance from any point in the boundary. We give in Theorem 13 combinatorial conditions which ensure the persistence of MESSI systems. This result rules out relevant boundary steady states in many enzymatic examples, for instance in those in [1].

We first strengthen condition $(\mathcal{C})$ with the following:

- $(\mathcal{C}')$ Condition $(\mathcal{C})$ holds and moreover, for every intermediate complex y_k there exist a *unique* non-intermediate complex y_{ij} such that $y_{ij} \to_\circ y_k$ in G.

We clarify in Example 32 in the SI the meaning of condition $(\mathcal{C}')$. Recall that a digraph is weakly reversible when for any pair of nodes in the same connected component there is a directed path joining them. We impose this with the following condition:

- $(\mathcal{C}'')$ Given a MESSI system with digraph G, the associated multidigraph MG_2 does not have parallel edges and the digraph G_2 is weakly reversible.

We then have the following persistence result:

Theorem 13. *Consider a MESSI system G with a minimal partition of the set of species, such that the network satisfies Conditions $(\mathcal{C}')$ and $(\mathcal{C}'')$. Assume moreover that there are no directed cycles in the digraph G_E. Then G has no relevant boundary steady states and so the system is persistent.*

Example 14 (Examples 5 and 6, continued)**.** The MESSI network in Example 5 from Figure 2 (A) (with partition $\mathscr{S}^{(1)} = \{S_0, S_1\}$, $\mathscr{S}^{(2)} = \{P_0, P_1\}$, $\mathscr{S}^{(3)} = \{E\}$, $\mathscr{S}^{(4)} = \{F\}$) is persistent since there are no directed cycles in G_E (depicted on the upper right in Figure 3). However, this is not the case in Example 6 from Figure 1(D), $x_p = X_{tot}, y_p = Y_{tot}, x = x_t = x_p y = x_T y_p = y = 0$ is

a boundary steady state in the stoichiometric compatibility class defined by X_{tot}, Y_{tot}. Recall that we are considering the (minimal) partition $\mathscr{S}^{(1)} = \{X, XT, X_p\}$, $\mathscr{S}^{(2)} = \{Y, Y_p\}$. The associated graph G_E has a cycle (depicted on the lower right in Figure 3).

Remark 15. Note that a necessary condition for system (1) to have a positive steady state is the existence of a positive relation among the vectors $y' - y$, that is, a positive vector λ such that $\sum_{y \to y'} \lambda_{yy'}(y' - y) = 0$. If this is satisfied, we will say that the system is *consistent*. As MESSI systems are conservative, the existence of non-negative steady states is guaranteed by fixed-point arguments. Indeed, a version of the Brouwer fixed point theorem guarantees that a non-negative steady state exists in each compatibility class. If moreover the system has no boundary steady states, which can be checked via Theorem 13, we deduce the existence of a positive steady state in each compatibility class, and in particular, the consistency of the system.

Toric MESSI systems and Multistationarity

We present in this section a necessary and sufficient criterion to decide whether a system is multistationary, which holds for a frequent subclass of MESSI systems, that we call *toric MESSI systems* (see Definitions 16 and 19). Again, the assumptions we make seem to be very restrictive. Nevertheless, it can be easily seen that all standard phosphorylation cascades, multisite sequential phosphorylation networks and many two component bacterial networks are of this form, so there is a wide range of applications. This is summarized in Theorems 24 and 26. We implemented this result by means of Algorithm 27, which certifies mono or multistationarity, and in this last case, provides different choices of rate constants for which multistationarity occurs.

Toric and s-toric MESSI systems

We start with a general definition of toric MESSI systems and then we show that many common MESSI systems satisfy this condition in an explicit way coming from the structure of the network, which we call s-toric. Recall that a binomial is a polynomial with two terms and that a Laurent monomial is a monomial with integer exponents, which can be negative.

Definition 16. A *toric MESSI system* is a MESSI system whose positive steady states can be described with *binomials*. Equivalently, they can be parametrized by Laurent *monomials*.

From now on, we will assume that we are given a MESSI network G for which condition $(\mathcal{C}')$ in the previous section holds. Given an intermediate complex $y_k = U_k$, let y_{ij} be the unique non-intermediate complex reacting through intermediates to y_k and denote by $x^{\varphi(k)}$ the monomial:

$$x^{\varphi(k)} = \begin{cases} x_i x_j & \text{if} \quad y_{ij} = X_i + X_j \\ x_i & \text{if} \quad j = 0 \text{ and } y_{ij} = X_i. \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

As we recalled, [15, Theorem 3.1] defines a map $\boldsymbol{\tau} : \mathbb{R}^{\#\mathcal{E}}_{>0} \to \mathbb{R}^{\#\mathcal{E}_1}_{>0}$, such that the steady states of the mass-action chemical reaction systems defined by G with rate constants $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ and G_1 with rate constants $\boldsymbol{\tau}(\boldsymbol{\kappa})$, are in one-to-one correspondence via the projection $\pi(u, x) = x$. We get the following easy explicit consequence.

Proposition 17. *Given a MESSI network G that satisfies Condition $(\mathcal{C}')$, there are (explicit) rational functions $\mu_k \in \mathbb{Q}(\boldsymbol{\kappa}), 1 \leq k \leq p$, such that for any steady state $x \in \mathbb{R}^n_{>0}$ of the associated MESSI network G_1, the steady state $\pi^{-1}(x) = (u(x), x)$ of G is given by the monomial map:*

$$u_k(x) \,=\, \mu_k \, x^{\varphi(k)}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, p. \tag{6}$$

The rational functions μ_k are in simple cases the usual Michaelis-Menten constants associated with the original rate constants $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$.

In order to define s-toric MESSI systems, we need to use some concepts from graph theory. A spanning tree of a digraph is a subgraph that contains all the vertices, is connected and acyclic as an undirected graph. An i-tree of a graph is a spanning tree where the i-th vertex is its unique sink (equivalently, it is the only vertex of the tree with no edges leaving from it). For an i-tree T, call c^T the product of the labels of all the edges of T. For the associated graph G_2 of a MESSI network G, the products c^T are monomials depending in principle on both the rate constants τ and the x-variables.

Definition 18. We say that a MESSI network G is *regulated* if for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and any choice of i-trees T, T' of G_2°, the quotient $c^T/c^{T'}$ only depends on the rate constants τ.

Examples of regulated networks are the phosphorylation cascades, as there is a unique i-tree for each i. Our second running Example 6 is also regulated (see the details in the SI). Moreover, phosphorylation cascades, the multisite sequential distributive phosphorylation system, the multisite processive phosphorylation system, and the bacterial EnvZ/OmpR network depicted in Figure 1 are toric MESSI systems with the following structural property.

Definition 19. A *structurally toric*, or *s-toric MESSI system*, is a MESSI system whose digraph G satisfies Conditions $(\mathcal{C}')$ and $(\mathcal{C}'')$, and is regulated.

It holds that an s-toric MESSI system is toric and, moreover, its positive steady states can be described by explicit binomials. The first part of the following statement is detailed in the SI.

Theorem 20. *Any s-toric MESSI system is toric. Moreover, we can choose $s-m$ explicit binomials with coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}(\boldsymbol{\kappa})$ which describe the positive steady states.*

In particular, given a MESSI network G with a partition of the set of species as in (2), assume that for each $\alpha \geq 1$ and $X_i \neq X_j \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ in the same connected component of G_2 there exists a unique simple path P_{ji} in G_2° from X_j to X_i.[2] *Then, the associated dynamical system is s-toric and there exist explicit μ_k and η_{ij} in $\mathbb{Q}(\boldsymbol{\kappa})$ such the $s-m$ binomials describing the positive steady states can be chosen from the following:*

(7) $u_k - \mu_k x^{\varphi(k)} = 0$, *for each intermediate U_k $(1 \leq k \leq p)$,*

(8) $x_h x_i - \eta_{ij} x_\ell x_j = 0$, *if $X_i \xrightarrow{\tau x_h} X_j$ is in G_2° and $X_j \xrightarrow{\tau' x_m} X_\ell$ is in P_{ji}.*



Example 21 (Example 5, continued)**.** For the cascade in Example 5, we denote the concentration of the intermediate species es_0, fs_1, s_1p_0, fp_1 by u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, respectively. The corresponding rational functions $\mu_1, \dots \mu_4$ in the statement of Proposition 17 equal:

$$\mu_1 = \frac{\kappa_1}{\kappa_2 + \kappa_3}, \mu_2 = \frac{\kappa_4}{\kappa_5 + \kappa_6}, \mu_3 = \frac{\kappa_7}{\kappa_8 + \kappa_9}, \mu_4 = \frac{\kappa_{10}}{\kappa_{11} + \kappa_{12}}.$$

We further denote $\eta_1 = \frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1}, \eta_2 = \frac{\tau_4}{\tau_3}$. According to Theorem 20, the following $6 = 10 - 4$ binomials describe the positive steady states of the associated MESSI system:

$$u_1 - \mu_1 e.s_0 \;=\; u_2 - \mu_2 f.s_1 \;=\; u_3 - \mu_3 s_1.p_0 \;=\; u_4 - \mu_4 f.p_1 \;=\; e.s_0 - \eta_1 f.s_1 \;=\; s_1.p_0 - \eta_2 f.p_1 = 0.$$

The first four binomials correspond to (7) and the last two occur in (8).

Detecting multistationarity in toric MESSI systems

In this section, we present Theorem 24, which gives a necessary and sufficient criterion to detect the capacity for multistatiorarity of a MESSI system. It is deduced from results in [33] and [35].

[2] A *simple path* is a path that visits each vertex exactly once.

Then, we give in Proposition 25 checkable conditions that ensure the validity of the hypotheses of Theorem 24. When the system is not monostationary, we finally show in Theorem 26 how to choose rate constants for which the system shows multistationarity (see also [4, 10]).

Let G be a toric MESSI network. Assume the positive steady states of the associated dynamical system are described by binomials $x^{v'} - \eta x^v$. We call T the subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$ generated by all these vectors $v' - v$. Choose any matrix B whose columns form a basis of T. For a positive vector x write $(x^B)_j = x^{B_j}$, where B_j denotes the j-th column of B. Then, there exists a constant vector $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ such that x is a positive steady state of the associated system if and only if $x^B = \boldsymbol{\eta}$. Considering the orthogonal complement of T in $\mathbb{R}^s$, we construct another matrix $B^\perp$ whose rows form a basis of the orthogonal subspace $T^\perp$. We can choose both B and $B^\perp$ with integer entries. We consider also a matrix M whose columns form a basis of the stoichiometric subspace S. Again, we construct a matrix $M^\perp$ whose rows form a basis of the orthogonal complement $S^\perp$. Thus, when the stoichiometric and the kinetic spaces coincide, the row vectors of $M^\perp$ are the coefficients of a basis of linear conservation relations. For any natural number s we denote $[s] = \{1, \dots, s\}$. Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times s}$ with $s \geq d$ and a subset $J \subseteq [s]$, we denote by A_J the submatrix of A with column indices in J. We furthermore denote J^c the complement of J in $[s]$ and $\nu(J) = \sum_{j\in J} j$. An orthant $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^s$ is defined by the signs of the coordinates of its points and it will be identified with a vector in $\{-1, 0, 1\}^s$.

Definition 22. Given matrices $M^\perp$ and $B^\perp$ as above, with $d = \operatorname{rank}(M^\perp) = \operatorname{rank}(B^\perp)$, we define the following sets of signed products

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma &= \{\operatorname{sign}(\det(M_I^t)\det(B_I^t)) : I \subseteq [s], \#I = s - d\},\\
\Sigma^\perp &= \{\operatorname{sign}((-1)^{\nu(J)}\det(M_J^\perp)\det(B_{J^c}^t)) : J \subseteq [s], \#J = d\},\\
\Sigma_\perp &= \{\operatorname{sign}((-1)^{\nu(J)}\det(M_{J^c}^t)\det(B_J^\perp)) : J \subseteq [s], \#J = d\},\\
\Sigma_\perp^\perp &= \{\operatorname{sign}(\det(M_J^\perp)\det(B_J^\perp)) : J \subseteq [s], \#J = d\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We say that a set $\sigma \neq \{0\}$ of signs is *mixed* if $\{-, +\} \subset \sigma$, and *unmixed* otherwise.

The following lemma is a consequence of Lemma 2.10 in [33] (and the references therein).

Lemma 23. *With the notations of Definition 22, if any of the four signs sets $\Sigma, \Sigma^\perp, \Sigma_\perp, \Sigma_\perp^\perp$ is different from $\{0\}$ the four of them are, and if so, if any of the four is mixed, all of them are mixed.*

Our following theorem gives a necessary and sufficient criterion to determine if the toric MESSI system is monostationary, based on [33] and [35].

Theorem 24. *Let G be a toric MESSI network with matrices M and B as above, which verifies that $\operatorname{rank}(M) = rank(B) = d$ and the signs sets $\Sigma, \Sigma^\perp, \Sigma_\perp, \Sigma_\perp^\perp$ are different from $\{0\}$. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

1. *The associated MESSI system is monostationary.*
2. *The signs sets $\Sigma, \Sigma^\perp, \Sigma_\perp, \Sigma_\perp^\perp$ are unmixed.*
3. *For all orthants $\mathcal{O} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^s, \mathcal{O} \neq \mathbf{0}$, either $S \cap \mathcal{O} = \emptyset$ or $T^\perp \cap \mathcal{O} = \emptyset$.*

For s-toric MESSI systems we give in Proposition 25 below sufficient conditions for the hypothesis in Theorem 24 that the ranks of M and B coincide. These conditions are not necessary, but if any of them is not satisfied the ranks might be different.

Proposition 25. *Let G be a MESSI network G which satisfies Conditions ($\mathcal{C}'$) and ($\mathcal{C}''$). Assume that the associated MESSI system is s-toric, the partition is minimal, the associated digraph G_E has no directed cycles, and, moreover, $S = S'$. Then,* $\operatorname{rank}(M^\perp) = \operatorname{rank}(B^\perp) = m$.

If a toric MESSI system is not monostationary and it is consistent, we can effectively construct two different steady states x^1 and x^2 and a reaction rate constant vector $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ that witness multistationarity based on item (3) in the statement of Theorem 24, following the arguments in [35] (see also [4, 10]).

Theorem 26. *Let G be a consistent MESSI network which satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 24, such that the associated system is toric and it is not monostationary. Then, for any choice of $\mathbf{w} \in S, \mathbf{v} \in T^\perp$ in the same orthant, the positive vectors x^1 and x^2 defined as*

$$\begin{aligned} \left(x_i^1\right)_{i=1,\ldots,s} &= \begin{cases} \frac{w_i}{e^{v_i}-1}, & \text{if } v_i \neq 0 \\ \text{any } \bar{x}_i > 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \mathbf{x}^2 &= \operatorname{diag}(e^{\mathbf{v}})\,\mathbf{x}^1, \end{aligned}$$

are two different steady states of the given toric MESSI system for any vector of rate constants $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ which is a positive solution of the linear system $\frac{dx}{dt}(x^1, \boldsymbol{\kappa}) = 0$, with $\frac{dx}{dt}(x^1, \boldsymbol{\kappa})$ as in (1).

An algorithm to find different steady states in multistationary toric MESSI systems

We present here an algorithm based on Theorems 24 and 26 which checks whether a consistent toric MESSI system has the capacity for multistationarity. In this case, it looks for orthants where S and $T^\perp$ meet and finds two different steady states in the same stoichiometric compatibility class, together with a corresponding set of reaction constants (based on [10, 4, 35]).

The algorithm to find these orthants relies on the theory of oriented matroids [2, 37, 38]. Recall that the *support* of a vector is defined as the set of its non-zero coordinates. A circuit of a real matrix A is a non-zero element $r \in \operatorname{rowspan}(A)$ with minimal support (with respect to inclusion). Given an orthant $\mathcal{O}$ (resp. a vector v), a circuit r is said to be *conformal* to $\mathcal{O}$ (resp. v) if for any index i *in its support*, $\operatorname{sign}(r_i) = \mathcal{O}_i$ (resp. $\operatorname{sign}(r_i) = \operatorname{sign}(v_i)$). A key result is that every vector $v \in \operatorname{rowspan}(A)$ is a nonnegative sum of circuits confomal to v [38]. All the circuits of A can be described in terms of vectors of maximal minors of A (see Lemma 40 in the SI) and one can thus compute all orthants containing vectors in $\operatorname{rowspan}(A)$, as those orthants $\mathcal{O}$ whose support equals the union of the supports of the circuits conformal to $\mathcal{O}$. These arguments also allow us to check the consistency of a given network, that is, whether there is a positive element in the kernel of a matrix with rows given by the vectors $y' \to y$.

Algorithm 27. Given a consistent toric MESSI system with network G, the following procedure finds, if there exist, multistationarity parameters $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ or decides that the system is monostationary.

Input: A toric MESSI network G.

Step 0: Compute matrices $M^\perp$ (or M) and B (or $B^\perp$) for G.

Step 1: Compute $\Sigma^\perp$ (or any of the sets $\Sigma, \Sigma_\perp, \Sigma_\perp^\perp$). Check if $\Sigma^\perp$ is mixed.[3] If it is unmixed, stop and assert that the system is monostationary.

Step 2: Compute the circuits for $B^\perp$ and find an orthant whose support equals the union of the circuits conformal to it.

Step 3: For the orthant computed in Step 2, check if there is a conformal circuit of M contained in this orthant. In this case, check whether its support equals the union of the circuits of M conformal to it. Otherwise, ignore it, and go back to Step 2.

Step 4: For each orthant $\mathcal{O}$ with $S \cap \mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset$ and $T^\perp \cap \mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset$, keep the conformal circuits.

Step 5: Build vectors $\mathbf{v} \in T^\perp$ and $\mathbf{w} \in S$, for example, as the sum of the corresponding conformal circuits.[4]

Step 6: Output x^1, x^2 and $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ that witness multistationarity, as in Theorem 26.

The rows of $M^\perp$ usually present some nice structure that minimizes the search for orthants containing a circuit, because in the conditions of Theorem 8 all columns corresponding to the same set in the partition of the species are equal, which produces many zero minors that can be predicted.

[3] The whole computation might not be needed for this. Efficiency can certainly be improved in any step.

[4] Any positive linear combination of the circuits will give a possible choice of vectors $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}$.



FIGURE 4. Witnesses for multistationarity of the phosphorylation cascade with one phosphatase F, with reaction constants and total amounts obtained from two orthants $\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2$ given by Algorithm 27. Upper plots depict the two different steady steates constructed from $\mathcal{O}_1$, while lower plots correspond to $\mathcal{O}_2$. Initial states for each case: Left: $S_0 = S_{tot}$, $P_0 = P_{tot}$, $E = E_{tot}$, $F = F_{tot}$; Right: $S_0 = S_{tot}$, $P_1 = P_{tot}$, $E = E_{tot}$, $F = F_{tot}$. We used the function `ode23s`, from the package *odepkg* version 0.8.5 in Octave [8].

We implemented this algorithm in Octave [8] for the cascades in Figure 2. In the multistationary case of only one phosphatase F, we obtained two different orthants where S and $T^{\perp}$ meet. In both cases, we computed the corresponding rate constants $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ and the steady states x^1 and x^2. We simulated the system for the two sets of constants obtained, and different initial conditions on the same stoichiometric compatibility class, respectively (see Figure 4).

DISCUSSION

Our contribution to the study of many different important biological systems modeled with mass-action kinetics is the identification of a common underlying structure in quite diverse networks. We call this a MESSI structure, since it describes Modifications of type Enzyme-Substrate or Swap with Intermediates. The mathematical formulation of the distinguished properties of MESSI biological systems allows us to prove general results on their dynamics from the structure of the network. We give very precise hypotheses that ensure the validity of our statements and which can be easily verified in common networks of biological interest.

The structure of MESSI biological systems

Supplementary Information

Alicia Dickenstein and Mercedes Pérez Millán

In this appendix we give in Section A examples and remarks to help understand the definitions and claims in the main text, and in Section B we provide the proofs of our results. We refer to the main text for the notations, definitions and complete statements.

Contents

Appendix A. Examples and remarks 15
A.1. MESSI systems 15
A.2. Conservation relations and persistence of MESSI systems 16
A.3. Toric MESSI systems and multistationarity 17
Appendix B. Proofs 18
B.1. Conservation Relations and Persistence 19
B.2. Toric MESSI systems and Multistationarity 22
B.3. S-toric MESSI systems 23
B.4. Algorithm 25
References 25

Appendix A. Examples and remarks

A.1. MESSI systems.

Example 28 (Basic example of an enzymatic network)**.** We present a basic example that illustrates how a chemical reaction network gives rise to a dynamical system. This example represents a classical mechanism of enzymatic reactions, usually known as the futile cycle [25, 23, 51]:

$$S_0 + E \underset{\kappa_2}{\overset{\kappa_1}{\rightleftarrows}} U_1 \overset{\kappa_3}{\to} S_1 + E \qquad S_1 + F \underset{\kappa_5}{\overset{\kappa_4}{\rightleftarrows}} U_2 \overset{\kappa_6}{\to} S_0 + F, \tag{9}$$

where U_1 and U_2 are *intermediate species*, S_0 and S_1 are *substrates*, E and F are *enzymes*. The source and the product of each reaction are called *complexes*. The concentrations of the six species change in time as the reactions occur. We order the $s = 6$ species as follows: U_1, U_2, S_0, S_1, E, F, and we denote the concentrations by $[U_1] = u_1$, $[U_2] = u_2$, $[S_0] = x_1$, $[S_1] = x_2$, $[E] = x_3$, $[F] = x_4$. The first three complexes in the network (9) give rise to the vectors $(0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0)$, $(1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ and $(0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0)$. Under the assumption of *mass-action kinetics*, we obtain then the following polynomial dynamical system:

$$\frac{du_1}{dt} = \kappa_1 x_1.x_3 - (\kappa_2 + \kappa_3)u_1, \quad \frac{du_2}{dt} = \kappa_4 x_2.x_4 - (\kappa_5 + \kappa_6)u_2,$$

$$\frac{dx_1}{dt} = -\kappa_1 x_1.x_3 + \kappa_2 u_1 + \kappa_6 u_2, \quad \frac{dx_2}{dt} = -\kappa_4 x_2.x_4 + \kappa_5 u_2 + \kappa_3 u_1,$$

$$\frac{dx_3}{dt} = -\kappa_1 x_1.x_3 + (\kappa_2 + \kappa_3)u_1, \quad \frac{dx_4}{dt} = -\kappa_4 x_2.x_4 + (\kappa_4 + \kappa_5)u_2.$$

We recall that intermediate complexes of a MESSI system satisfy the following condition:

($\mathcal{C}$) For every intermediate complex y_k, there exist non-intermediate complexes y_{ij} and $y_{\ell m}$ such that $y_{ij} \to_\circ y_k$ and $y_k \to_\circ y_{\ell m}$,

where the notation $y \to_\circ y'$ means that complex y reacts to complex y' via intermediates: either $y \to y'$ or there exists a path of reactions from y to y' only through intermediate complexes.

Example 29 (Toy example of MESSI systems)**.** We present a toy example that shows which kind of reactions are allowed and which are not. Conside the digraph, were assume Y_1 and Y_2 are monomolecular complexes:

$$X_1 + X_2 \to Y_1 \rightleftarrows Y_2 \to Y_3.$$

Then, Y_1 and Y_2 must consist of an intermediate species by rule ($\mathcal{R}_1$). For Condition ($\mathcal{C}$) to hold, necessarily Y_3 must be a non-intermediate complex since there are no arrows leaving from Y_3. Moreover, rule ($\mathcal{R}_1$) imposes that Y_3 is of the form $X_\ell + X_m$, and by rule ($\mathcal{R}_3$), if $X_1 \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ and $X_2 \in \mathscr{S}^{(\beta)}$, then $\alpha \neq \beta$ and either $X_\ell \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}, X_m \in \mathscr{S}^{(\beta)}$ or $X_m \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}, X_\ell \in \mathscr{S}^{(\beta)}$.

A.2. **Conservation relations and persistence of MESSI systems.**

Example 30 (Necessity of the hypotheses in Theorem 8 describing all the linear conservation relations)**.** The following is example 22 from [39]. It satisfies the hypotheses in Theorem 8 except for the abscence of swaps:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 + X_5 &\to X_2 + X_6 \\ X_3 + X_6 &\to X_4 + X_5 \\ X_4 + X_6 &\to X_3 + X_7. \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to see that $\mathscr{S}^{(1)} = \{X_1, X_2\}$, $\mathscr{S}^{(2)} = \{X_3, X_4\}, \mathscr{S}^{(3)} = \{X_5, X_6, X_7\}$, is the only possible *minimal* partition, which gives three linearly independent conservation relations ℓ_1, ℓ_2, ℓ_3. However, there is a fourth independent conservation relation:

$$x_1 + x_4 + x_6 + 2x_7 = C.$$

Remark 31 (Conditions to ensure that the kinetic and the stoichiometric subspaces coincide)**.** In order to be able to assert whether the stoichiometric and the kinetic subspaces coincide, an important sufficient condition was stated in [11]. The following concepts from graph theory are needed to present the result. A subgraph of G is said to be strongly connected if for each ordered pair of vertices in the subgraph there is a directed path from the first vertex to the second one. If the subgraph is maximal with this property, we call it a strongly connected component of G. The strongly connected components of G lead to a new graph whose vertices are these components, and there is an edge from one component to the other if there is a reaction in G from one complex in one component to some complex in the other one. If one component has no edges leaving from it, it is called *terminal strongly connected component*. Then, if G has only one terminal strongly connected component in each connected component, the number of generators of the conservation relations are $s - \dim(S)$ [11], where $s = n + p$ is the total number of species and S is the stoichiometric subspace. In this case, the stoichiometric and the kinetic subspaces coincide.

When there is more than one terminal strongly connected component in one connected component, even if there are no swaps, we can find other conservation relations. For instance, in the following example:

$$X_3 \overset{\kappa_1}{\leftarrow} X_1 \underset{\kappa_3}{\overset{\kappa_2}{\rightleftarrows}} X_2 \overset{\kappa_4}{\to} X_4,$$

with $S^{(0)} = \emptyset$ and $S^{(1)} = \{X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4\}$, besides the linear relation $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 = C_1$, we get another independent relation $\kappa_4\kappa_1 x_2 - \kappa_4\kappa_2 x_3 + (\kappa_3 + \kappa_4)x_4 = C_2$.

Example 32. Network (A) on the left of Figure 5 satisfies Condition $(\mathcal{C}')$, while network (B) on the right does not since both non-intermediate complexes X_1 and X_2 react via intermediates to the intermediate complex U_2.

(A) 

(B) $X_1 \rightleftarrows U_1 \to U_2 \rightleftarrows X_2$.

FIGURE 5. Validity of condition $(\mathcal{C}')$

Example 33 (Example of non-comparable partitions)**.** Consider the following network:

$$X_1 + X_2 \to X_3 + X_4, \quad X_4 + X_5 \to X_6 + X_1.$$

Set $\mathscr{S}^{(0)} = \emptyset$, $\mathscr{S}^{(1)} = \{X_1, X_4\}$ and $\mathscr{S}^{(2)} = \{X_2, X_3, X_5, X_6\}$. We can refine $\mathscr{S}^{(2)}$ into $\mathscr{S}'^{(2)} = \{X_2, X_3\}$ and $\mathscr{S}'^{(3)} = \{X_5, X_6\}$. In both cases, we get the structure of a MESSI network. If we instead consider $\mathscr{S}''^{(0)} = \emptyset$, $\mathscr{S}''^{(1)} = \{X_1, X_3, X_5\}$ and $\mathscr{S}''^{(2)} = \{X_2, X_4, X_6\}$ there is no possible way of refining $\mathscr{S}''^{(2)}$ without violating $(\mathcal{R}_3)$. The second and third partitions are not comparable and both are minimal in the poset of partitions of the species set which yield a MESSI structure on the given network.

A.3. **Toric MESSI systems and multistationarity.**

Example 34 (Running Examples 5 and 6, continued)**.** For both of our running examples, the associated digraph G_2 is regulated. Recall that the graph G_2° for the cascade in Example 5 is

$$S_0 \underset{\tau_2 f}{\overset{\tau_1 e}{\rightleftarrows}} S_1 \quad P_0 \underset{\tau_4 f}{\overset{\tau_3 s_1}{\rightleftarrows}} P_1.$$

Clearly, for each vertex there is only one simple directed path from the other vertex in the same connected component. For example, the only S_1-tree, T, is $S_0 \overset{\tau_1 e}{\to} S_1$, $c^T = \tau_1 e$ and $\gamma_{S_1} = e$.

For the system in Example 6, the graph G_2° is:

$$X \underset{\tau_2}{\overset{\tau_1}{\rightleftarrows}} XT \overset{\tau_3}{\to} X_p \qquad Y \underset{\tau_5 x_T}{\overset{\tau_4 x_p}{\rightleftarrows}} Y_p.$$

In this case, there are two X-trees:

$$T_1: \; X \underset{\tau_2}{\leftarrow} XT \; X_p \qquad T_2: \; X \; XT \overset{\tau_3}{\to} X_p.$$

However, we can define $\gamma_X = y$, so that $c^{T_1} = \tau_2\tau_4\gamma_X$, $c^{T_2} = \tau_3\tau_4\gamma_X$. For the other vertices, the corresponding tree is unique, and therefore this MESSI network is regulated.

Example 35 (Example 5, continued)**.** Consider the two phosphorylation cascades in Figure 2 of the main text. Both cascades differ in the phosphatases: the cascade in Figure 2 (B) has different phosphatases for each layer, while the cascade (A) does not. The set Σ corresponding to the cascade in (B) is unmixed, which according to Theorem 24 implies that the system is monostationary. In contrast, the set Σ for the cascade in (A) is mixed, and the system has the capacity for multistationarity. For instance, if we consider J the set of indices corresponding to S_0, P_0, ES_0 and FP_1, and $\tilde{J}$ the set of indices corresponding to S_0, P_1, ES_0 and FP_1 (where $4 = \operatorname{rank}(M^\perp) = \operatorname{rank}(B^\perp)$), $\operatorname{sign}(\det(M_J^\perp)\det(B_J^\perp)) \neq \operatorname{sign}(\det(M_{\tilde{J}}^\perp)\det(B_{\tilde{J}}^\perp))$, and they are both nonzero.

If we add the reactions $P_1+D \rightleftarrows P_1D$, which represent a drug interacting with the phosphorylated form P_1, we can check that this new system remains multistationary for the cascade (A). The new matrices $\hat{M}$ and $\hat{B}$ can be obtained in the following way:

$$\hat{M}^t = \left(\begin{array}{ccccc|cc} & & & & & P_1 & D & P_1D \\ & & & & & * & 0 & 0 \\ & & M^t & & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ & & & & & * & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & & 1 & 1 & -1 \end{array}\right) \qquad \hat{B}^t = \left(\begin{array}{ccccc|cc} & & & & & P_1 & D & P_1D \\ & & & & & * & 0 & 0 \\ & & B^t & & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ & & & & & * & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & & 1 & 1 & -1 \end{array}\right)$$

Both set of indices J and $\tilde{J}$ witnessing multistationarity do not contain P_1. Then, from the structure of the matrix $\operatorname{sign}(\det(\hat{M}^t_{J\cup\{P_1\}})\det(\hat{B}^t_{J\cup\{P_1\}})) \neq \operatorname{sign}(\det(\hat{M}^t_{\tilde{J}\cup\{P_1\}})\det(\hat{B}^t_{\tilde{J}\cup\{P_1\}}))$, which by Theorem 24 ensures that the cascade with the drug is multistationary.

Example 36 (Necessity of a hypothesis in Proposition 25)**.** If there are directed cycles in G_E, we cannot assert that $\operatorname{rank}(M^\perp) = \operatorname{rank}(B)$. Consider for instance the following MESSI network without intermediate complexes:

$$\begin{array}{ll} S_0 + R_1 \overset{\kappa_1}{\to} S_1 + R_1 & S_1 + R_0 \overset{\kappa_2}{\to} S_0 + R_0 \\ P_0 + S_0 \overset{\kappa_3}{\to} P_1 + S_0 & P_1 + S_1 \overset{\kappa_4}{\to} P_0 + S_1 \\ R_0 + P_0 \overset{\kappa_5}{\to} R_1 + P_0 & R_1 + P_1 \overset{\kappa_6}{\to} R_0 + P_1, \end{array}$$

where $\mathscr{S}$ is the disjoint union of $\mathscr{S}^{(1)} = \{S_0, S_1\}$, $\mathscr{S}^{(2)} = \{P_0, P_1\}$, and $\mathscr{S}^{(3)} = \{R_0, R_1\}$. The corresponding digraph G_2 equals:

$$S_0 \underset{\kappa_2 r_0}{\overset{\kappa_1 r_1}{\rightleftarrows}} S_1 \qquad P_0 \underset{\kappa_4 s_1}{\overset{\kappa_3 s_0}{\rightleftarrows}} P_1 \qquad R_0 \underset{\kappa_6 p_1}{\overset{\kappa_5 p_0}{\rightleftarrows}} R_1$$

and the digraph G_E is a cycle: $\mathscr{S}^{(1)} \to \mathscr{S}^{(2)} \to \mathscr{S}^{(3)}$.

We call s_0, s_1 the concentrations of S_0, S_1 (respectively), p_0, p_1 the concentrations of P_0, P_1, r_0, r_1 the concentrations of R_0, R_1. There are three linearly independent conservation relations:

$$s_0 + s_1 = C_1, \quad p_0 + p_1 = C_2, \quad r_0 + r_1 = C_2.$$

We expect the rank of B to be 3. But the system equals

$$dx_0/dt = -\kappa_1 s_0 r_1 + \kappa_2 s_1 r_0,\ dy_0/dt = -\kappa_3 s_0 p_0 + \kappa_4 s_1 p_1,\ dz_0/dt = -\kappa_5 p_0 r_0 + \kappa_6 p_1 r_1,$$

and so we can choose B to be the matrix: $\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, which has rank 2.

Assume there exists a positive steady state. Then, we deduce that

$$\kappa_1\kappa_4\kappa_5 = \kappa_2\kappa_3\kappa_6. \tag{10}$$

So, when (10) is not satisfied, there are no positive steady states and when it is satisfied, any of the three steady state equations is a consequence of the other two, and when we intersect with the linear variety defined by the conservation relations, we get a variety of dimension 1, with an infinite number of positive steady states (there are 5 equations in 6 variables).

Appendix B. Proofs

We assume the reader is familiar with the notion of the Laplacian $\mathcal{L}(G)$ of a digraph G and its main properties. One key observation is that mass-action kinetics associated with a linear digraph G with variables $x = (x_1, \dots, x_s)$ equals $\dot{x} = \mathcal{L}(G)x$. A second key observation is that the fact that the rows of $\mathcal{L}(G)$ add up to zero translates into $\sum_{i=1}^s \dot{x}_i = 0$, and so $\sum_{i=1}^s x_i$ is a conserved quantity. The last key observation is that when G is strongly connected, the kernel of $\mathcal{L}(G)$ has

dimension one and there is a known generator ρ_G with positive entries described as follows. Recall that a spanning tree of a digraph is a subgraph that reaches each vertex, is connected and acyclic as an undirected graph. An i-tree of of a graph is a spanning tree where the i-th vertex is its unique sink (equivalently, the i-th is the only vertex of the tree with no edges leaving from it). For an i-tree T, call c^T the product of the labels of all the edges of T. Then, the i-th coordinate of $\rho(G)$ equals

$$(\rho_G)_i = \sum_{T\ an\ i-tree} c^T. \tag{11}$$

We refer the reader to [31] for a detailed account.

B.1. **Conservation Relations and Persistence.** As in the statement of Theorem 8, consider a chemical reaction network G and a partition of the set of species $\mathscr{S}$ that defines a MESSI structure. Our aim is to prove that for each subset of species $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$, $1 \leq \alpha \leq m$, the linear form ℓ_α defined in display (3) in the main text, defines a conservation relation of the system. Furthermore, if there are no swaps in G, and the partition is minimal in the poset of partitions defining a MESSI system structure on G, then we will prove that $\dim(S^\perp) = m$. If moreover the stoichiometric subspace coincides with the kinetic subspace (see Remark 31), then we will show that the only possible conservation relations in the system are linearly generated by the conservations defined by $\ell_\alpha, 1 \leq \alpha \leq m$.

We start with an ancillary Lemma. We call S_1 the stoichiometric subspace of the biochemical network defined by the associated digraph G_1 of a MESSI reaction network G (with stoichiometric subspace S). We denote by $\tilde{S_1} = \{(0, \ldots, 0, w) \in \mathbb{R}^{p+n} : w \in S_1 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\}$ the lifting of S_1 to $\mathbb{R}^{p+n}$

Lemma 37. *With the previous notations, we have the equality:*

$$\dim(S) = \dim(S_1) + p. \tag{12}$$

Moreover, assume that condition $(\mathcal{C}')$ *holds and consider the vectors*

$$v_k = y_k - y_{i_k j_k}. \tag{13}$$

Then, $S = \tilde{S_1} \oplus \langle v_1, \ldots, v_p \rangle$.

Proof. The equality of dimensions in (12) follows inmediately from Lemma 1 in the Electronic Supplementary Material (ESM) of [15]. It is clear, from the definitions of $\tilde{S_1}$ and the vectors v_k, that $\tilde{S_1} \cap \langle v_1, \ldots, v_p \rangle = \{0\}$ (as no intermediate complex appears in the reactions of G_1). Moreover the vectors v_k are linearly independent, and therefore $\dim(\langle v_1, \ldots, v_p \rangle) = p$. Thus, we only need to show now that $S \supseteq \tilde{S_1} \oplus \langle v_1, \ldots, v_p \rangle$.

For simplicity, we will asume that all non-intermediate complexes consist of two species, but it is easy to adapt the proof for the case where the non-intermediate complexes consist of only one species. We first notice that $v_k \in S$ for all k. In fact, if $X_{i_k} + X_{j_k} \to_\circ U_k$, there exist $U_{k_1}, \ldots, U_{k_t}$ intermediates such that the chain of reactions $X_{i_k} + X_{j_k} \to U_{k_1} \to \cdots \to U_{k_t} \to U_k$ is in G. Therefore from the telescopic sum $y_k - y_{i_k j_k} = (y_k - y_{k_t}) + (y_{k_t} - y_{k_t - 1}) + \cdots + (y_{k_2} - y_{k_1}) + (y_{k_1} - y_{i_k j_k})$, we see that $v_k \in S$, as we wanted to prove. Given $X_i + X_j \to X_\ell + X_m$ in G_1, there exist intermediates $U_{k_1}, \ldots, U_{k_t}$ such that the chain of reactions $X_i + X_j \to U_{k_1} \to \cdots \to U_{k_t} \to X_\ell + X_m$ is in G. As above, from a telescopic sum we deduce that $y_{\ell m} - y_{ij} \in S$. Hence, $\tilde{S_1} \subseteq S$ and $\tilde{S_1} \oplus \langle v_1, \ldots, v_p \rangle \subseteq S$. □

We will also need Lemma 12 in the main file.

Proof of Lemma 12. Each vertex in the associated digraph G_2 to the digraph G is labeled by only one species. If one species of $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ appears on a vertex of G_2, by $(\mathcal{R}_2)$ and $(\mathcal{R}_3)$ and the construction of G_2, all the species in the vertices of the corresponding connected component of G_2 belong to the

same $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$. Moreover, if two core species X_i, X_h in the same subset $\mathscr{S}^{\alpha)}$ correspond to different connected components of G_2, then for any complex y_{ij} containing X_i and any complex $y_{h\ell}$ contaning X_h, the relation $y_{ij} \to_\circ y_{h\ell}$ does *not* hold. It follows that we can refine each subset $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ as the disjoint union of the subsets of species in each connected component of G_2 which consists of species in $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$, and no further refinament is possible if the set of intermediate species is maximal. □

We are ready to prove Theorem 8. We will mainly adapt the results in [15] (Theorem 2.1) to our setting.

Proof of Theorem 8. Given a chemical reaction network G and a partition of the set of species $\mathscr{S}$ that leads to a MESSI system with the given complexes and reactions, consider the mass-action system defined by G_1, with species $X_1, \dots, X_n$. By Theorem 2.1 in [15], the conservation relations in G are in one-to-one correspondence with the conservation relations of G_1, in an explicit way that we detail below under our hypotheses. Recall that by Remark 11, the associated graph G_2 determines the same steady state equations.

Fix $\alpha \geq 1$. As we remarked in the proof of Lemma 12, each subset $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ coincides with the variables in the labels of some of the connected components of the associated digraph G_2. Given such a connected component H, let $\mathscr{S}_H^{(\alpha)}$ be its set of vertex labels. As G_2 is a linear digraph, H is also linear and so the matrix of the associated (linear) system is given by its Laplacian $\mathcal{L}(H)$. Therefore, the sum of its rows equals zero, which means that $\sum_{X_i \in S_H^{(\alpha)}} \dot{x}_i = 0$ and a fortiori $\sum_{X_i \in S^{(\alpha)}} \dot{x}_i = 0$, for the mass-action system defined by G_1. We find now the corresponding linear combination which includes the concentrations of the intermediate species by adapting Lemma 1 in the ESM of [15].

Let $w^\alpha \in \{0,1\}^n$ be the characteristic vector of $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$, so that $\langle w^\alpha, \dot{x}\rangle = \sum_{X_i \in S^{(\alpha)}} \dot{x}_i$. For any complex y^j of G_1, we know from $(R2)$ and $(R3)$ that it has at most one species in $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$. Then,

$$\omega^\alpha \cdot y^j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if there is a species of } \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)} \text{ in } y^j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Define the $(p+n)$-vector:

$$\widetilde{\omega}_i^\alpha = \begin{cases} w_i^\alpha & \text{for } i = p+1, \dots, p+n \\ 1 & \text{if } i \in \mathrm{Int}(\alpha) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

Recalling that $\mathrm{Int}(\alpha) = \{k : \exists y_{ij} \to_\circ y_k \text{ with } X_i \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)} \text{ or } X_j \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}\}$, we deduce that Lemma 1 in the ESM of [15] asserts precisely that the linear form defined by $\widetilde{\omega}^\alpha$ leads to the conservation of the whole network associated with the linear form defined by w^α on the variables in $\mathscr{S}_1 = \mathscr{S} \setminus \mathscr{S}^{(0)}$. But this linear form is precisely ℓ_α, as we wanted to prove. As we are assuming that all species participate in at least one reaction and intermediate species satisfy condition $(\mathcal{C})$, we have that $\mathscr{S}^{(0)} = \cup_{\alpha=1}^m \mathrm{Int}(\alpha)$. Therefore, all coefficients of the conservation relation $\sum_{\alpha=1}^m \ell_\alpha$ are positive and we get that any MESSI system is conservative.

To see the second part of the statement, note that $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m$ are linearly independent conservations relations and so $\dim(S^\perp) = s - \dim(S) \geq m$. It only remains to prove that, if G has no swaps, then $s - \dim(S) \leq m$. But as $\dim(S) = \dim(\tilde{S}_1) + p$ by Lemma 37, it is enough to show that $\dim(\tilde{S}_1) \geq n - m$. If $X_i + X_j \to X_\ell + X_k$ in G_1, and there are no swaps in G, either $i \in \{\ell, k\}$ or $j \in \{\ell, k\}$. Assume, without loss of generality, that $j = k$. Then $e_\ell - e_i \in S_1$, for e_i is the i-th canonical vector of $\mathbb{R}^n$. As $\mathscr{S}$ is minimal, if $X_i, X_\ell \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$, necessarily X_i and X_ℓ belong to the same connected component of G_2. Then there is a undirected path between X_i and X_ℓ in G_2. By a telescopic sum, as in Lemma 37, we have that each vector $e_\ell - e_i \in S_1$ for each $X_i, X_\ell \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$. Fix $X_i \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$, then for all $\ell \neq i$, $e_\ell - e_i \in S_1$. This gives us $n_\alpha - 1$ linearly

independent vectors for each $\alpha \geq 1$, which are in turn linearly independent from the corresponding vectors obtained from each β, $\beta \neq \alpha$, $1 \leq \beta \leq m$ (when $n_\alpha > 1$). Adding over $\alpha \geq 1$ we obtain $n-m$ linearly independent vectors in S. (Notice that if $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ is a singleton, $\#\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)} - 1 = 0$.) Therefore, $\dim(S) \geq p + n - m = s - m$, which is what we wanted to prove. The total number of conservation relations in a system is equal to the codimension of the kinetic subspace. If morover the kinetic subspace equals $\mathscr{S}$, then $\dim(S^\perp) = m$, as claimed. □

We now focus on the occurrence of boundary steady states. Before proving Theorem 13 we first prove Proposition 17, which is based on the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [15] (Theorem 2 in their ESM).

Proof of Proposition 17. Following the arguments in [15], we build a new labeled directed graph $\widehat{G}$ with node set $\mathscr{S}^{(0)} \cup \{*\}$, which consists of collapsing all non-intermediate complexes into the vertex $*$, and labeled directed edges that are obtained from hiding the non-intermediate complexes in the labels. For example, $X_i + X_j \xrightarrow{\kappa} U_k$ becomes $* \xrightarrow{\kappa x_i x_j} U_k$ and $U_k \xrightarrow{\kappa'} X_i + X_j$ becomes $U_k \xrightarrow{\kappa'} *$. This new graph is linear, and satisfies that $\dot{\mathbf{u}} = 0$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{L}(\widehat{G})\,\widetilde{\mathbf{u}} = 0$, where $\widetilde{\mathbf{u}} = (u_1, \ldots, u_p, 1)^t$ (this last coordinate stands for "the concentration" of the node $*$). It is important to notice that the graph $\widehat{G}$ is strongly connected by Condition $(\mathcal{C})$.

Then, at steady state we obtain that $\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}$ is proportional to the vector $\rho_{\widetilde{G}} = (\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_p, \rho)$ defined in (11), so that $u_k = \rho_k/\rho$ for any $k = 1, \ldots, p$. It is straightforward to check that every $*$-tree involves labels in $\mathbb{Q}[\kappa]$. On the other hand, for every U_k, as by Condition $(\mathcal{C}')$ there is a unique non-intermediate complex $y_{i_k j_k}$ such that $y_{i_k j_k} \to_\circ y_k$, every k-tree involves labels in $\mathbb{Q}[\kappa, x_{i_k} x_{j_k}]$. Moreover, as there must be a path from $*$ to U_k in each k-tree, $x_{i_k} x_{j_k}$ necessarily appears as a label on those trees. Then,

$$u_k = \mu_k\, x_{i_k} x_{j_k},\ k = 1, \ldots p, \tag{14}$$

where

$$\mu_k = \frac{\rho_k}{x_{i_k} x_{j_k}} \frac{1}{\rho} \in \mathbb{Q}(\kappa).$$

□

Remark 38. With the notations and hypotheses of the previous proof, we can compute the map $\boldsymbol{\tau} : \mathbb{R}^r \to \mathbb{R}^{r_1}$, based on the proof of Theorem 3 in the ESM of [15]. We define for each $X_i + X_j \to_\circ X_\ell + X_m$ in G the reaction constant τ in G_1 which gives the label $X_i + X_j \xrightarrow{\tau} X_\ell + X_m$, by:

$$\tau = \kappa + \sum_{k=1}^{p} \kappa_k \mu_k,$$

where $\kappa \geq 0$ is positive when $X_i + X_j \xrightarrow{\kappa} X_\ell + X_m$ in G (and $\kappa = 0$ otherwise), and $\kappa_k \geq 0$ is positive if $U_k \xrightarrow{\kappa_k} X_\ell + X_m$ and $X_i + X_j \to_\circ U_k$ in G (and $\kappa_k = 0$ otherwise). In particular, we see that $\mathbb{Q}(\tau) \subset \mathbb{Q}(\boldsymbol{\kappa})$.

Proof of Theorem 13. Assume there is a boundary steady state in some stoichiometric compatibility class that intersects the positive orthant. As Condition $(\mathcal{C}')$ holds, we have Equation (14) in the proof of Proposition 17. If there is an intermediate species U_k such that $u_k = 0$ at steady state, then either $x_{i_k} = 0$ or $x_{j_k} = 0$ at steady state. Therefore, if there is a boundary steady state, there is a non-intermediate species $X_i \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$, for some $\alpha \geq 1$, such that $x_i = 0$ at steady state.

We will prove that the vanishing of the concentration of one core species x_i at steady state, implies the vanishing of all the concentrations x_j for any $j \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$. Considering again the equalities (14), it follows that $u_k = 0$ for any $k \in \mathrm{Int}(\alpha)$. But these are precisely the variables occurring in the linear form ℓ_α. This is a contradiction since ℓ_α equals a positive constant C_α.

Recall that a vertex in a directed graph has *indegree zero* if it is not the tail of any directed edge. Let us define the sets of indices

$$L_0 = \{\beta \geq 1 : \text{indegree of } \mathscr{S}^{(\beta)} \text{ is } 0\},$$

$$L_k = \{\beta \geq 1 : \text{ for any edge } \mathscr{S}^{(\gamma)} \to \mathscr{S}^{(\beta)} \text{ in } G_E \text{ it holds that } \gamma \in L_t, \text{ with } t < k\} \setminus \bigcup_{t=0}^{k-1} L_t, k \geq 1.$$

The main observation that makes the following inductive argument work is that as $\mathscr{S}$ is finite and there are no directed cycles in G_E, there must exist a subset $\mathscr{S}^{(\beta)}$ with $1 \leq \beta \leq m$ such that its indegree in G_E is zero. This means that $L_0 \neq \emptyset$.

So, let $k \geq 0$ be minimal with the property that there exists $\alpha \in L_k$ and a core species $X_i \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ such that $x_i = 0$ at steady state. Denote by x^α a vector with coordinates x_j, for every $j \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ (in some order). By our hypothesis that the partition is minimal, we have by Lemma 12 that there is a connected component G_2^α of G_2 with n_α nodes corresponding to the species in $\mathscr{S}(\alpha)$. Moreover, this component is strongly connected by our assumption that G_2 is weakly reversible.

If $k = 0$, the labels in G_2^α are constants in $\mathbb{Q}[\tau]$. By Condition $(\mathcal{C}'')$, x^α is a multiple of $\rho^\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}[\tau]^{n_\alpha}$ as in (11), which has nonzero entries since G_2^α is strongly connected. Thus, if $x_i = 0$, then $x^\alpha = 0.\rho^\alpha$ and every X_j in $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ satisfies $x_j = 0$ at steady state. Assume now that $\alpha \in L_k$ for some $k \geq 1$. By the minimality of k, we have that $x_j \neq 0$ at steady state for any $X_j \in \mathscr{S}^{(\beta)}$ with $\beta \in L_t, t < k$. The labels in the strongly connected component G_2^α belong to $\mathbb{Q}[\tau, x_\beta : \beta \in L_t, t < k]$, which we are assuming to be nonzero, and so ρ^α has nonzero entries. As above, necessarily every X_j in $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ satisfies $x_j = 0$ at steady state.

□

B.2. **Toric MESSI systems and Multistationarity.** We recall that a chemical reaction system has the capacity for multistationarity if there exists a choice of rate constants such that there are two or more *positive* steady states in one stoichiometric compatibility class $(x^0 + S) \cap \mathbb{R}^s_{\geq 0}$ for some initial state $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^s_{\geq 0}$ (and it is monostationary otherwise).

Remark 39. Consider a toric MESSI system whose positive steady states can be described by binomial equations of the form $x^{y'} - \eta x^y = 0$. Equivalently, the positive steady states of the toric MESSI system can be described by the monomial equations $x^{y'-y} = \eta$, where we consider Laurent monomials. We construct now a matrix B whose columns form a basis of the subspace T generated by these difference vectors $y' - y$, and also the monomial map $x \mapsto x^B$, where $(x^B)_j = x^{B_j} = x_1^{B_{1j}} \cdot \cdots \cdot x_s^{B_{sj}}$, for each column B_j of B. Then x^* is a positive steady state of the system if and only if ${x^*}^B = \tilde{\eta}$ for an appropriate vector $\tilde{\eta}$. Thus, the system is monostationary *for any choice of rate constants* if and only if the monomial map $x \mapsto x^B$ is injective on each stoichiometric compatibility class $(x^0 + S) \cap \mathbb{R}^s_{>0}$ for every $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^s_{>0}$.

We will prove Theorem 24 by adapting Proposition 3.9 and Corollary 2.15 in [33], and Theorem 5.5 in [35] to our setting.

Proof of Theorem 24. Under the hypotheses in the statement, want to prove the equivalence of the assertions:

(i) The associated MESSI system is monostationary.
(ii) The signs sets $\Sigma, \Sigma^\perp, \Sigma_\perp, \Sigma_\perp^\perp$ are unmixed.
(iii) For all orthants $\mathcal{O} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^s, \mathcal{O} \neq \mathbf{0}$, either $S \cap \mathcal{O} = \emptyset$ or $T^\perp \cap \mathcal{O} = \emptyset$.

We first prove (i) ⇔ (ii) by adapting the results in [33]. We will see that (i) and (ii) are both equivalent to

$$\{\text{sign}(v) : v \in \ker(B^t)\} \cap \{\text{sign}(v) : v \in S\} = \{0\},$$

where $(\mathrm{sign}(v))_i = \mathrm{sign}(v_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, s$. This is also equivalent, by the definition of $T^\perp$ to

$$\{\mathrm{sign}(v) : v \in T^\perp\} \cap \{\mathrm{sign}(v) : v \in S\} = \{0\}. \tag{15}$$

By Remark 39, (i) is equivalent to the injectivity of the map $x \mapsto x^B$ on each stoichiometric compatibility class $(x^0 + S) \cap \mathbb{R}^s_{>0}$. We deduce from Proposition 3.9 in [33] that (i) is equivalent to (15). Previously, in Corollary 2.15 the authors had proved that (15) is in turn equivalent to asking that for all $J \subseteq [s]$, $\#J = s - d = \mathrm{rank}(B) = \mathrm{rank}(M)$, $\det(B_J)\det(M_J)$ is either zero or has the same sign as all other nonzero products, and moreover, at least one such product is nonzero. In other words, (15) is equivalent to the set Σ being unmixed. By Lemma 23, this is equivalent to (ii). To finish the proof, we just need to show that (15) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iii), but this is straightforward. □

We now prove Theorem 26.

Proof of Theorem 26. By Theorem 24, if the system is not monostationary, we know that there exists an orthant $\mathcal{O} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^s, \mathcal{O} \neq \mathbf{0}$, such that $S \cap \mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset$ and $T^\perp \cap \mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset$. Then, there exist $\mathbf{w} \in S, \mathbf{v} \in T^\perp$ such that $\mathrm{sign}(\mathbf{w}) = \mathrm{sign}(\mathbf{v})$. Inspired by Theorem 5.5 in [35], for any index i not in the support of $\mathbf{v}$, we choose any positive real number h_i and we define positive vectors x^1 and x^2 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(x^1_i\right)_{i=1,\ldots,s} &= \begin{cases} \frac{w_i}{e^{v_i}-1}, & \text{if } v_i \neq 0 \\ h_i, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ x^2 &= \mathrm{diag}(e^{\mathbf{v}})\, x^1 \end{aligned}$$

where "e^x" for a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^s_{>0}$ denotes the vector $(e^{x_1}, e^{x_2}, \ldots, e^{x_s}) \in \mathbb{R}^s$ and $\mathrm{diag}(x)$ denotes the diagonal matrix whose diagonal is the vector x.

As the system is consistent, there exists a positive vector λ such that $\sum_{y \to y'} \lambda_{yy'}(y' - y) = 0$. For any edge $y \to y'$, take the (positive) rate constant

$$k_{yy'} = \lambda_{yy'}(x^1)^{-y},$$

which defines give a positive vector $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ satisfying

$$\frac{dx}{dt}(x^1, \boldsymbol{\kappa}) = \sum_{y \to y'} \kappa_{yy'}\, (x^1)^y\, (y' - y) = 0.$$

Then, x^1 is a positive steady state of the system for these reaction rate constants $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$. As the system is a toric MESSI system x^1 is a solution of the binomial equations that describe the positive steady states. Call $\boldsymbol{\eta} := (x^1)^B$. Then, x is a positive steady state of the system if and only if $x^B = \boldsymbol{\eta}$. It can be checked that $((x^2)^B)_j = e^{\langle \mathbf{v}, B_j \rangle}(x^1)^{B_j}$ and, as $\mathbf{v} \in T^\perp$, we have $(x^1)^B = (x^2)^B = \boldsymbol{\eta}$. Therefore, x^2 is also a positive steady state of the system. Moreover, $x^2 - x^1 = \mathbf{w} \in S$, which proves that x^1 and x^2 belong to the same stoichiometric compatibility class. □

B.3. **S-toric MESSI systems.** We show now that the *positive* steady states of s-toric MESSI systems can be described by binomials and we postpone the proof of the choice of very explicit binomials when any nodes in the same component are connected by a single simple path.

Proof of the first part of Theorem 20. Assume G satisfies condition $(\mathcal{C}'')$ and let x be a positive steady state. Let $X_i \neq X_j$ in $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ lying in the same connected component H of G_2. Let $\rho(H)$ be the explicit generator of the kernel of $\mathcal{L}(H)$ as in (11). Then,

$$\rho(H)_j x_i - \rho(H)_i x_j = 0.$$

Fix a j-tree T_0. The product of the labels c_{T_0} of all the edges in T_0 is equal to a monomial x^{γ_j} times a polynomial in the rate constants τ. For any other j-tree T, the hypothesis that G is regulated

ensures that $c_T = \mu_T(\tau)\, c_{T_0}$, with $\mu_T \in \mathbb{Q}(\tau)$. It follows that the quotient of the sum $\rho(H)_j$ by x^{γ_j} lies in $\mathbb{Q}(\tau)$ (and also there exists a monomial x^{γ_i} such that $\rho(H)_i/x^{\gamma_i} \in \mathbb{Q}(\tau)$). Call

$$\eta_{ij} = \rho(H)_i x^{\gamma_j}/\rho(H)_j x^{\gamma_i} \in \mathbb{Q}(\tau) \subset \mathbb{Q}(\boldsymbol{\kappa}). \tag{16}$$

Then, $x^{\gamma_j} x_i - \eta_{ij} x^{\gamma_i} x_j = 0$. Combining this with Equation (14), the *positive* steady states can be described by the binomials:

$$\begin{aligned} &u_k - \mu_k x^{\varphi(k)}, \text{ for each intermediate species } U_k \\ &x^{\gamma_j} x_i - \eta_{ij} x^{\gamma_i} x_j, \text{ if } X_i, X_j \text{ lie in the same connected component of } G_2. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 25. As we assume that the associated digraph G_E has no directed cycles, it is easy to check that there are no swaps in G. If moreover the kinetic and the stoichiometric subspaces S', S coincide and the partition of species $\mathscr{S}$ is minimal, we have proved in Theorem 8 that there are exactly m conservation relations for the system, and then $\operatorname{rank}(M^\perp) = m$.

We show now that $\operatorname{rank}(B) = s - m$, or equivalently, that $\dim(T) = s - m = p + n - m$. From Equations (14) we see that the vectors v_k defined in (13) live in T for all $1 \le k \le p$ (recall that y_k denotes the vector corresponding to the monomolecular complex U_k). This implies that $\langle v_1, \dots, v_p \rangle \subseteq T$. As none of the exponents determined by (17) involves any variable u_i, it is enough to find $n - m$ linearly independent vectors in T that have support in the last n coordinates.

Call T_x the projection $\pi_x(T)$ of T onto the last n coordinates corresponding to $x_1, \dots, x_n$. We need to prove then that $\dim(T_x) = n - m$. For each $\alpha \ge 1$, fix $i_\alpha \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ and for each $X_j \in \mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$, $j \ne i_\alpha$, call $z_{i_\alpha j} = (\gamma_j + e_{i_\alpha}) - (\gamma_{i_\alpha} + e_j)$, the vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$ deduced from the exponents of the binomials in (17). Denote by T_α the linear subspace with generators $\{z_{i_\alpha j}\}_{j \ne i_\alpha}$. We claim that $\dim(T_\alpha) = n_\alpha - 1$ for any $\alpha \ge 1$ and that $T_x = T_1 \oplus T_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus T_m$

To prove these claims, we need to recall the proof of Theorem 13 We consider again the subsets $L_0, L_1, \dots$ and assume that $\alpha \in L_k$. Then, as remarked in the last paragraph of that proof, it holds that the connected component G_2^α with vertices in $\mathscr{S}^{(\alpha)}$ (ensured by Lemma 12 by our hypothesis of minimality of the partition), has labels in $\mathbb{Q}[\tau, x_\beta : \beta \in L_t, t < k]$. This implies that the j-th coordinate of the vector $z_{i_\alpha h}$ equals -1 if $h = j$ and 0 otherwise. So the vectors $\{z_{i_\alpha j}\}_{j \ne i_\alpha}$ are linearly independent, that is, $\dim(T_\alpha) = n_\alpha - 1$, and by a similar argument we deduce that the sum is direct. Therefore, $\dim(T_x) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^m (n_\alpha - 1) = n - m$, as wanted. □

To prove the second part of Theorem 20 we first need a combinatorial Lemma.

Lemma 40. *Assume H is a digraph with the property that there is a unique simple path P_{ij} from any node X_i to any node X_j in the same connected component of H. Then*

(i) *For each vertex X_i of H there is only one i-tree, denoted by T_i.*
(ii) *Let $X_i \xrightarrow{\tau x_h} X_j$ be and edge in H. Then, T_i is obtained from T_j by deleting the edge $X_i \xrightarrow{\tau x_h} X_j$ and adding the edge $X_j \xrightarrow{\tau' x_m} X_\ell$, where X_ℓ is such that $X_j \xrightarrow{\tau' x_m} X_\ell$ is in P_{ji}.*

Proof. Proof of item (i): Let X_j ($j \ne i$) be in the same connected component of H as X_i. In any i-tree there is an edge leaving from X_j, otherwise X_j would be another sink different from X_i. Moreover, there must be a path from X_j to X_i in any such i-tree. If the path visits some vertex twice (or more times) there would be a cycle in the underlying undirected graph of the tree, which is not possible. Hence, the path is simple. By hypothesis, there is only one choice for this path and so there is only one i-tree in H.

Proof of item (ii): Call T' the new digraph obtained from T_j by deleting the edge $X_i \xrightarrow{\tau x_h} X_j$ and adding the edge $X_j \xrightarrow{\tau' x_m} X_\ell$. T' still visits every vertex of the corresponding connected component of H, and the only vertex from which no arrows leave is X_i. We claim that there are no cycles in

T'. In fact, the only possible cycle in T' must involve the new edge from X_j to X_ℓ. Then, there is a directed path in T' (and therefore in H) from X_ℓ to X_j. Moreover, as the paths in T_j are simple, this path from X_ℓ to X_j in T' is simple. But in H there is another simple path $P_{\ell i} \cup \{X_i \to X_j\}$ from X_ℓ to X_j, which is different from the one obtained in T' since the edge $X_i \to X_j$ does not exist in T'. This is a contradiction since by assumption there is only one simple path in H from X_ℓ to X_j. Then, $T' = T_i$. □

Proof of the second part of Theorem 20. If there is a unique simple path P_{ij} from each X_i to each X_j in the same connected component of G_2, and $X_i \xrightarrow{\tau x_h} X_j$ is in G_2, the binomial in (17) involves the edges on T_i and the edges on T_j. But, from Lemma 40, T_i and T_j only differ in the edges $X_i \xrightarrow{\tau x_h} X_j$ and $X_j \xrightarrow{\tau' x_m} X_\ell$, where X_ℓ is such that $X_j \xrightarrow{\tau' x_m} X_\ell$ is in P_{ji}. Then, the following binomials define the positive steady states:

$$u_k - \mu_k x^{\varphi(k)}, \text{ for each intermediate species } U_k$$

$$\tau x_h x_i - \tau' x_m x_j \text{ if } X_i \xrightarrow{\tau x_h} X_j \text{ in } G_2 \text{ and } X_j \xrightarrow{\tau' x_m} X_\ell \text{ is in } P_{ji}.$$

□

B.4. **Algorithm.** Step 1 in the algorithm follows directly from Theorem 24. Step 7 follows from [10, 4, 35] and Theorem 26. Theorem 20 explains how to find a matrix B for an s-toric MESSI system. The intermediate steps follow from the following considerations. Given a matrix A, every vector in rowspan(A) is a conformal sum of circuits. (We refer the reader to [38, 45, 32].) Moreover, the circuits of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times s}$ of rank d, are found in the following way. For $J \subseteq [s]$ with $\#J = d-1$, define $r_J \in \text{rowspan}(A)$ as the vector $r_{J,\ell} = (-1)^{\mu(\ell,J)} \det(A_{J\cup\{\ell\}})$, where $\mu(\ell, J)$ is the sign of the permutation of $J \cup \{\ell\}$ which takes ℓ followed by the ordered elements of J to the ordered elements of $J \cup \{\ell\}$, for all $\ell \in \{0, \dots, s\}$. The following lemma is straightforward and well known:

Lemma 41. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times s}$ be a matrix of rank d and $J \subseteq [s]$ such that $\#J = d-1$ and $\text{rank}(A_J) = d-1$. Then r_J is a circuit of A. Moreover, up to multiplicative constant, these are all the circuits of A (possibly repeated).*

References

[1] D. Angeli, P. De Leenher, and E. Sontag, *A Petri net approach to the study of persistence in chemical reaction networks*, Mathematical Biosciences 210 (2007), 598 –618.

[2] A. Björner, M. Las Vergnas, B. Sturmfels, N. White, and G. Ziegler, Oriented matroids, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications v. 46, 2nd. edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[3] S. Catozzi. J. P. Di-Bella, A. Ventura, J.-A. Sepulchre, *Signaling cascades transmit information downstream and upstream but unlikely simultaneously*, BMC Systems Biology 16(1) (2016), 1–20.

[4] C. Conradi, D. Flockerzi, and J. Raisch, *Multistationarity in the activation of a MAPK: Parametrizing the relevant region in parameter space*, Math. Biosci. 211(1), (2008), 105–131.

[5] C.Conradi, and A. Shiu, *A global convergence result for processive multisite phosphorylation systems*, Bull. Math. Biol. 77(1), (2015), 126–155.

[6] R. J. Davis, *Signal transduction by the JNK group of MAP kinases*, Cell, 103, (2000), 239–252.

[7] R. J. Deshaies, and J. E. Ferrell, *Multisite phosphorylation and the countdown to S phase*, Cell 107(7), (2001), 819–822.

[8] John W. Eaton, David Bateman, SÃ¸ren Hauberg, Rik Wehbring, *GNU Octave version 4.0.0 manual: a high-level interactive language for numerical computations*, (2015),

[9] Feinberg M. (1979), Lectures on chemical reaction networks, U. of Wisconsin, available at: `http://www.che.eng.ohio-state.edu/~FEINBERG/LecturesOnReactionNetworks`.

[10] M. Feinberg, *Multiple steady states for chemical reaction networks of deficiency one*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 132(4), (1995), 371–406.

[11] Feinberg M., Horn F., *Chemical mechanism structure and the coincidence of the stoichiometric and kinetic subspaces,* Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 66(1), (1977), 83–97.
[12] E. Feliu, and C. Wiuf, *Variable elimination in post-translational modification reaction networks with mass-action kinetics*, J. Math. Biol. 66, (2013), 281–310.
[13] E. Feliu, and C. Wiuf, *Enzyme-sharing as a cause of multi-stationarity in signalling systems*, J. R. Soc. Interface 7 9(71), (2012), 1224–1232.
[14] E. Feliu, and C. Wiuf, *Preclusion of switch behavior in reaction networks with mass-action kinetics*, Appl. Math. Comput., 219 (2012), 1449–1467.
[15] E. Feliu, and C. Wiuf, *Simplifying biochemical models with intermediate species*, J. R. Soc. Interface, (2013), 10:20130484.
[16] G. Gnacadja,*Reachability, persistence, and constructive chemical reaction networks (part II): a formalism for species composition in chemical reaction network theory and application to persistence*, J. Math. Chem. 49(10), (2011), 2137–2157.
[17] G. Gnacadja, *Reachability, persistence, and constructive chemical reaction networks (part III): a mathematical formalism for binary enzymatic networks and application to persistence*, J. Math. Chem. 49(10), (2011), 2158–2176.
[18] J. Gunawardena, *A linear framework for time-scale separation in nonlinear biochemical systems*, PLoS ONE, (2012), 7:e36321.
[19] N. Hermann-Kleiter, and G. Baier, *NFAT pulls the strings during CD4+ T helper cell effector functions*, Blood 115(15), (2010), 2989–2997.
[20] P. G. Hogan, L. Chen, J. Nardone, and A. Rao, *Transcriptional regulation by calcium, calcineurin, and NFAT*, Gene Dev. 17(18), (2003), 2205–2232.
[21] J. J. Hornberg, B. Binder, F. J. Bruggeman, B. Schoeber, R. Heinrich, and H. V. Westerhoff, *Control of MAPK signalling: from complexity to what really matters*, Oncogene 24, (2005), 5533–5542.
[22] W. Hsing, and T. J. Silhavy, *Function of conserved histidine-243 in phosphatase activity of EnvZ, the sensor for porin osmoregulation in Escherichia coli*, J. Bacteriol. 179, (1997), 3729–3735.
[23] C.-Y. F. Huang, and J. E. Ferrell, *Ultrasensitivity in the Mitogen-Activated Protein Kinase Cascade*, PNAS 93(19), (1996), 10078–10083.
[24] M. M. Igo, A. J. Ninfa, J. B. Stock, and T. J. Silhavy, *Phosphorylation and dephosphorylation of a bacterial transcriptional activator by a transmembrane receptor*, Genes Dev. 3, (1989), 1725–1734.
[25] B. N. Kholodenko, *Negative feedback and ultrasensitivity can bring about oscillations in the mitogen-activated protein kinase cascades*, Eur. J. Biochem., 267, (2000), 1583–1588.
[26] V.B. Kothamachu, E. Feliu, L. Cardelli, O.S. Soyer OS, *Unlimited multistability and Boolean logic in microbial signalling*, J. R. Soc. Interface 12 (2015): 20150234.
[27] J. M Kyriakis, and J. Avruch, *Mammalian mitogen-activated protein kinase signal transduction pathways activated by stress and inflammation*, Physiol. Rev., 81(2), (2001), 807–869.
[28] F. Macian, *NFAT proteins: key regulators of T-cell development and function*, Nat. Rev. Immunol. 5(6), (2005), 472–484.
[29] M. Marcondes de Freitas, E. Feliu, and C. Wiuf, *Intermediates, Catalysts, Persistence, and Boundary Steady States*, to appear: Journal of Mathematical Biology, 2016.
[30] N. I. Markevich, J. B. Hoek, and B. N. Kholodenko, *Signaling switches and bistability arising from multisite phosphorylation in protein kinase cascades*, J. Cell Biol. 164 (2004), 353–359.
[31] I. Mirzaev, J. Gunawardena, *Laplacian dynamics on general graphs*, Bull. Math. Biol., 75 (2013), 2118–2149.
[32] S. Müller, Regensburger, *Elementary vectors and conformal sums in polyhedral geometry and their relevance for metabolic pathway analysis*, arXiv:1512.00267v2 (2016)
[33] S. Müller, E. Feliu, G. Regensburger, C. Conradi, A. Shiu, A. Dickenstein, *Sign conditions for injectivity of generalized polynomial maps with applications to chemical reaction networks and real algebraic geometry*, Found. Comp. Math. 16(1) (2016), 69–97.
[34] G. Pearson, F. Robinson, T. Beers Gibson, B. E. Xu, M. Karandikar, K. Berman, and M. H. Cobb, *Mitogen-activated protein (MAP) kinase pathways: regulation and physiological functions*, Endocr. Rev., 22, (2001), 153–183.
[35] M. Pérez Millán, A. Dickenstein, A. Shiu, and C. Conradi, *Chemical reaction systems with toric steady states*, Bull. Math. Biol. 74(5), (2012), 1027–1065.
[36] L. Pratt, and T. J. Silhavy, *Porin regulation of* Escherichia coli, in Two-Component Signal Transduction, J. A. Hoch, T. J. Silhavy, Eds. (American Society for Microbiology, Washington, DC, 1995), 105–127.
[37] J. Richter-Gebert, and G. M. Ziegler, *Oriented matroids*, in Jacob E. Goodman and Joseph O'Rourke, Eds. (Handbook of Discrete and Computational Geometry, Chapman and Hall/CRC, 1997), 111–132.

[38] R. T. Rockafellar, *The elementary vectors of a subspace of R^N*, in Combinatorial Mathematics and its Applications (Proc. Conf., Univ. North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C., 1967), 104–127. Univ. North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N.C., 1969.
[39] M. Sáez, C. Wiuf, E. Feliu, *Graphical reduction of reaction networks by linear elimination of species*, to appear: Journal of Mathematical Biology, 2016.
[40] H. J. Schaeffer, and M. J. Weber, *Mitogen-activated protein kinases: specific messages from ubiquitous messengers*, Mol. Cell Biol. 19, (1999), 2435–2444.
[41] B. Schoeberl, C. Eichler-Jonsson, E. D. Gilles, and G. Muller, *Computational modeling of the dynamics of the MAP kinase cascade activated by surface and internalized EGF receptors*, Nat. Biotechnol., 20, (2002), 370–375.
[42] Y. D. Shaul, and R. Seger, *The MEK/ERK cascade: From signaling specificity to diverse functions*, Biochim. Biophys. Acta. 1773(8), (2007), 1213–1226.
[43] G. Shinar, and M. Feinberg, *Structural sources of robustness in biochemical reaction networks*, Science 327(5971), (2010), 1389–1391.
[44] A. M. Stock, V. L. Robinson, and P. N. Goudreau, *Two-component signal transduction*, Annu. Rev. Biochem. 69, (2000), 183–215.
[45] B. Sturmfels, *Gröbner Bases and Convex Polytopes*, American Math. Soc., University Lecture Series, Vol. 8, Providence, RI (1995).
[46] M. Thomson, and J. Gunawardena, *The rational parametrisation theorem for multisite post-translational modification systems*, J. Theor. Biol. 261, (2009), 626–636.
[47] M. Feinberg et al., *Chemical Reaction Network Toolbox*, available at: `https://crnt.osu.edu/CRNTWin`.
[48] A. Turjanski, J. Vaqué, and J. Gutkind, *MAP kinases and the control of nuclear events*, Oncogene 26, (2007), 3240–3253.
[49] W. T. Tutte, W. T., *The dissection of equilateral triangles into equilateral triangles*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc., 44, (1948), 463–482.
[50] Vol′pert A., Hudjaev S. (1985), Analysis in classes of discontinuous functions and equations of mathematical physics, volume 8 of Mechanics: Analysis, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
[51] L. Wang, and E. Sontag, *On the number of steady states in a multiple futile cycle*, J. Math. Biol. 57(1), (2008), 29–52.
[52] C. Widmann, S. Gibson, M. B. Jarpe, and G. L. Johnson, *Mitogen-activated protein kinase conservation of a three-kinase module from yeast to human*, Physiol. Rev., 79, (1999), 143–180.
[53] T. Zarubin, and J. Han, *Activation and signaling of the p38 MAP kinase pathway*, Cell Res. 15, (2005), 11–18.
[54] Y. Zhu, L. Qin, T. Yoshida, and M. Inouye, *Phosphatase activity of histidine kinase EnvZ without kinase catalytic domain*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 97, (2000), 7808–7813.

* Dto. de Matemática, FCEN, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Ciudad Universitaria, Pab. I, C1428EGA Buenos Aires, Argentina.

** IMAS (UBA-CONICET), Ciudad Universitaria, Pab. I, C1428EGA Buenos Aires, Argentina.
E-mail address: `alidick@dm.uba.ar, mpmillan@dm.uba.ar`